FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 018 *28 January 1986*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Reagan Avoids 'Key Question' in Disarmament Issues AA 1
[Leontiyev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA]
Shultz Declares U.S. Intention To Continue SDI AA 1
Chernyshev Criticizes Shultz Remarks AA 1
'Constructive' U.S. Response to Proposals Urged AA 3
[Bogdanov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Jan]
British, French Roles in Proposals Delineated AA 4
'Practical Support' Needed AA 4
'Special Mission' for Europe [Chernyshev] AA 5
MBFR Talks Resume; Opportunity for Accord AA 6
Soviet Delegation Arrives AA 6
MBFR Agreement 'Possible' [Vienna DIE PRESSE 27 Jan] AA 7
Ninth CDE Session To Open in Stockholm AA 7
Grinevskiy Remarks AA 7
Zholkver Commentary AA 8
Karpov, Israelyan Receive International Peace Group AA 9
U.S. Actions Counter New Soviet Proposal AA 10
[Ponomarev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jan]
Soviet Proposal Termed a Realizable 'Dream' [Burlatskiy] AA 12

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Moscow TV's 'Studio 9' on Gorbachev Arms Proposal CC 1
[Zorin, Primakov, Yefimov, Bovin]
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 13
[Grigoryev, Tsoppi, Charikov]
Shevardnadze Submits Letter to UN on Economic Ties CC 21
UN Envoy Cited on Debate on Israeli 'Aggression' [Chernyshev] CC 24
U.S. Said To 'Slander' UNESCO General Conference [Chernyshev] CC 25
William Colby Cited on Response to Arms Proposal [Serikov] CC 25
NATO War Games Marked by Deaths, Damage End Early CC 26
KYODO Cited on U.S.-PRC Joint Naval Exercises [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jan] CC 26

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Report, Commentary on U.S.-Libyan Tensions A 1
'Show of Force' Continues A 1
Kornilov Explains 'New Globalism' A 1
Space Shuttle Challenger Launch Delayed A 2
Reagan Remarks Show Arms Spending To Continue A 3
Weinberger Reaffirms Arms Buildup Policy A 3
Commentary on Savimbi's Upcoming Visit to U.S. A 3
May Be Funded 'Covertly' [Ivanov] A 3
'Lavish' Reception Prepared [Ulyanovskiy] A 4
Savimbi Expects 'Handouts' [Fesunenko] A 5
IZVESTIYA's Falin Studies U.S. Naval Strategy [23 Jan] A 5
KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Attacks Boston Journalist [Vitalyev, 23 Jan] A 7
Millions Awaiting U.S. Response to Peace Offer [Seyful-Mulyukov] A 11

NORTHEAST ASIA

MPR's Yondon Visits Military Facilities, Departs [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jan] C 1
U.S. Increases Pressure on Japan Over SDI C 1
[Agaforov in IZVESTIYA 27 Jan]

SOUTH ASIA

Kuznetsov, Delegation Tour India, Taj Mahal [PRAVDA 27 Jan] D 1
Further on Celebration of Indian National Day D 1
IZVESTIYA Cites Greetings [26 Jan] D 1
Indian Envoy Interviewed [Bulantsev in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Jan] D 2
Production Cooperation Group With India Ends Work [(Basibov)] D 2
Pakistani Support for Indian 'Extremists' Noted [Beloshapko] D 3
PRAVDA's Afanasyev Views Indian Ties With USSR [24 Jan] D 4
TV Reports on Karmal News Conference in Kabul [Leshchinskiy] D 7
DRA Tribes on Pakistani Actions Against Pashtuns D 7
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Jan]
Egyptian Newsman Applauds DRA Attitude to Muslims [IZVESTIYA 22 Jan] D 8

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

USSR Possible 'Guarantor' of Cambodia Accord [AFP] E 1
Murakhovskiy, SRV Visitor Discuss Agro-industry [PRAVDA 24 Jan] E 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Gorbachev Meets Italian Communist Party Leader [PRAVDA 28 Jan] G 1
Further on Tolkunov Visit to France G 1
Quoted in LE MONDE [Paris 26-27 Jan] G 1
Departs for Moscow G 1
IZVESTIYA Cites French Defense Minister on SDI [Kovalenko 27 Jan] G 2
Gorbachev Reportedly Asks Kohl's Support on Proposal [AFP] G 2
Portuguese Communist Party Cited on Elections G 3
Papandreou Expresses Support for Gorbachev Proposal G 3
CPSU Sends Greetings to San Marino Party Congress [PRAVDA 24 Jan] G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Soviet Official, DFLP Head To Visit Aden [Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD 28 Jan] H 1
Comparison of Reports on Departure of PDRY Leaders H 1
Trade Talks Held With YAR Delegation H 1
Reportage, Commentary on U.S. Maneuvers Off Libya H 2
Al-Turayki Urges UN Action H 2
Maneuvers 'Provocative Muscleflexing' H 2
Arab States Express Solidarity H 3
USSR Muslim Organization's Statement [IZVESTIYA 25 Jan] H 3
JANA Condemns U.S. 'Provocative Maneuvers' H 4
U.S. Attempting To Create Separate Deals With Arabs H 4
Arab Unity To Confront U.S.-Israeli 'Machinations' H 5
Jordanian Foreign Minister Meets Soviet Ambassador H 6

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Editorial Article on U.S. Support for RSA [IZVESTIYA 28 Jan] J 1
Sierra Leone President Receives Soviet Delegation [IZVESTIYA 25 Jan] J 3

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

CPSU Central Committee Greets Panamanian Party	K 1
Soviet, Cuban Officials Discuss Economic Plans	K 1
Cuban Delegation Arrives [Havana Radio Reloj]	K 1
Committee Chairmen Meet [Havana Radio Progreso]	K 1
Castro Replies to Soviet Greetings Message	K 2
New Guatamalan President Looks at Future Tasks	K 2

REAGAN AVOIDS 'KEY QUESTION' IN DISARMAMENT ISSUES

LD251151 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 25 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 25 TASS -- "The latest Soviet proposals have been welcomed with ethusiastic approval and support by the world public as a whole and by the governments and statesmen of many countries," Anatoliy Leontiyev says in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. "The press stresses in reactions and comments that these proposals are concrete, realistic and constructive and that they meet the vital interests of all the countries and peoples.

"As for the U.S. Administration, newspapers initially reported that the Soviet proposals caught it by surprise. The U.S. President, choosing his words carefully, expressed general satisfaction with another manifestation of the Soviet Union's commitment to the cause of peace and disarmament and promised to give careful consideration to Moscow's proposals. He said he hoped that at some time in the future (sic) an end will be put completely to nuclear weapons. What is important, however, is not what the president said but what he did not say. He avoided answering the key question: Does the USA agree to renounce its 'star wars' program, the main obstacle to ending an arms race on earth?"

"Neither did he say if the USA was at long last ready to join the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which had been extended by another three months, to March 31.

"American corporations reaped 203 billion dollars in profit (before taxes) in 1983. The figure in 1984 was 246 billion dollars and further climbed in 1985. Peace is a threat to these profits. That is why some figures in the USA still nurture the crazy idea that there are more important things than peace.

"We are against space weapons, against the mentality of a caveman, who only thought of finding as strong a club or as heavy a stone as possible. We are aware in full measure of our responsibility before the present and succeeding generations. It is our profound conviction that we should take into the third millennium not the 'star wars' program but large-scale projects for the peaceful exploration of space jointly by all the peoples."

SHULTZ DECLARES U.S. INTENTION TO CONTINUE SDI

LD262025 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 26 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 26 TASS -- As U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz declared unambiguously, the Washington administration is not going to give up the implementation of its plans to militarise outer space. It follows from his interview to the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT weekly that the United States will implement the programme of research set out in the "Strategic Defense Initiative" and will not be imposing any restrictions on this research. Shultz stressed that the President holds a clear and firm stand on the matter.

Chernyshev Criticizes Shultz Remarks

LD271444 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 27 Jan 86

[TASS military observer Vladimir Chernyshev commentary]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jan (TASS) -- In an interview with U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has stated that the United States will continue to implement SDI -- that is the 'star wars' program -- and that "no changes in this program are foreseen."

At the same time, the secretary of state asserted that the United States is "holding talks sincerely in Geneva." According to elementary logic one of these two assertions is false because they cannot both correspond to the truth at the same time. If anyone in Washington knows that, then George Shultz should.

First, it was the secretary of state who on behalf of his administration and together with the Soviet foreign minister drew up the joint Soviet-U.S. statement last January which, in defining the aims of the talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, clearly and unambiguously speaks of achieving an effective accord aimed at averting the arms race in space. Second, through his official duties G. Shultz should know that at the November 1985 summit the U.S. President signed a joint declaration which confirmed the stated aim -- the nonmilitarization of space. How then can the head of the foreign policy department juxtapose an assertion on "the sincere conduct" of the Geneva talks by the United States with a statement on the firm adherence by that same United States to a program aimed at militarizing space?

Not just Shultz, not just Washington, but the whole world knows the cause of the lack of progress at the Geneva talks: The United States is not carrying out the accord that was reached, is stubbornly avoiding a ban on space strike weapons, and is attempting to legalize the "star wars" program. While perfectly aware that keeping space free of weapons has a decisive significance for nuclear arms reductions, Washington continues to take ever new steps on the path to the implementation of SDI and heaps up ever more obstacles on the road to working out mutually acceptable decisions at Geneva.

Washington's position has become particularly unattractive now that the Soviet Union has proposed a concrete program, calculated for an historically short period, for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons in the world, when a real opportunity has arisen to do away with the nuclear threat through joint efforts. In such a situation, which makes the direct elimination of all nuclear weapons possible, the call to pile new mountains of weapons right up to the heights of space and even to speak of official Washington's alleged desire to "eliminate the nuclear threat" is at the least, not serious and to put it simply, is ridiculous.

Let us take another passage from Mr Shultz. Again he is talking about the "research" nature of the "star wars" program. This assertion once again, to put it mildly, does not correspond to reality. Work on this program is being conducted according to the instructions and contracts of the military department and at the stage when mockups and experimental models have to appear, field tests and finishing work is being done outside the laboratory. Surely Shultz knows that the Pentagon has already allocated 1,500 contracts for the "star wars" program, that the biggest military-industrial corporations are mastering the allocations made for these ends, and that not only in scientific laboratories, but in the works of these corporations high-energy laser installations, beam weapons systems, electromagnetic guns, and so on are being perfected? And what can the U.S. secretary of state say about the fact that concrete antimissile models for destroying targets outside the atmosphere and in the upper levels of the atmosphere are being developed on such Pentagon contracts as ("Hedi") ("Headeye"), and ("Braiduskill"). Can that also be regarded as "research" to Washington's way of thinking? Then what, in Mr G. Shultz's opinion is the weapons development called?

The time has come to become imbued with a sense of responsibility, to move over to political thinking which corresponds to the realities of the nuclear space age, and to reconsider Washington's approach to the most important problems of the present time. In the first place the representatives of the U.S. Administration need to remove the contradictions between their words and deeds.

'CONSTRUCTIVE' U.S. RESPONSE TO PROPOSALS URGED

PM271400 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Article by Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute, under the rubric "Entering the 21st Century Without Weapons": "Justifying the Planet's Hopes"]

[Excerpt] The Soviet-U.S. summit last November raised hopes that the international situation will be improved and universal security strengthened. However, for this to happen the Geneva process must be further developed. The Soviet Union, honestly implementing the Geneva accords, has proposed a phased, consistent, and complete elimination of nuclear arsenals, reducing the stockpiles of lethal arms to zero.

The first stage provides for a 50-percent reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States, with in 5-8 years, of nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. They are to retain no more than 6,000 charges each on the remaining delivery vehicles. Understandably, such a drastic reduction is possible only if both the Soviet Union and the United States refrain from the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. The creation of such weapons, as the Soviet Union has warned on more than one occasion, will shatter the hopes for a reduction of nuclear arms on earth. Consequently, a constructive approach by the U.S. side, above all on the space issue, is indispensable. Space must remain peaceful; strike weapons must not be deployed there. Preventing the arms race from spreading into near-earth space means paving the way to deep cuts in nuclear arms.

The first stage also envisages the elimination of medium-range Soviet and U.S. missiles, both ballistic and cruise missiles, in Europe. This would represent the first step toward ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union and the United States would have to pledge that they would not supply strategic or medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France would have to promise that they would not build up their corresponding nuclear arms.

The second stage would begin no later than 1990 and last 5-7 years. At this stage the remaining nuclear powers would join in nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union and the United States would continue with the reductions agreed on during the first stage. They would also implement further measures to eliminate their medium-range nuclear arms and freeze their tactical nuclear means. When the 50-percent reduction of corresponding arms is accomplished by the Soviet Union and the United States, another radical step would be taken, namely the elimination by all nuclear powers of their tactical nuclear weapons. During the same period the Soviet-U.S. accord on banning space strike arms would become multilateral, entailing the obligatory participation of all leading industrial powers. In addition, all nuclear powers would have to end nuclear weapons tests.

The third stage would begin no later than 1995. The elimination of nuclear arms would be completed. By the end of 1999 there would be no nuclear weapons left on earth. A universal accord would be elaborated pledging never again to produce such weapons. Herein lies the tremendous historic significance of the Soviet initiative and its unique, practical thrust.

The Soviet proposals are far-reaching, topical, and specific. We regard reliable verification as a most important and indispensable element in the implementation of the measures to eliminate nuclear and other types of weapons. Wherever verification by means of national technical facilities does not produce sufficient confidence, comprehensive use can be made of on-site inspections and other forms of international verification.

Another circumstance must be specially mentioned. As distinct from the U.S. "star wars" plan which hinges on the creation [sozdaniye] of new space strike weapons utilizing nuclear energy, our program is truly a program to remove the nuclear danger. An important precondition for its implementation is rising above national egoism, tactical calculations, disputes, and discord. Their significance is negligible compared with the preservation of mankind's main asset, namely peace and a secure future.

The entire content of the [Gorbachev] statement is concrete new evidence of the peace-loving foreign policy of our party and state. It is the practical implementation of the line of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and of the principled provisions of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program, the course of struggle for peace and social progress.

The time has come to definitively and irreversibly put an end to the senseless nuclear arms race. "Nuclear explosions must stop disfiguring the face of our common refuge, the planet earth," the USSR Supreme Soviet appeal to the U.S. Congress says. "The nuclear threat must be eliminated once and for all." The dialogue which was initiated at summit level has shown that it is possible to achieve accords provided that both sides display readiness to act in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted in Geneva. The Soviet Union has shown its readiness to act in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted in Geneva. The Soviet Union has shown its readiness by putting forward a concrete disarmament program. We are waiting for Washington's constructive response.

BRITISH, FRENCH ROLES IN PROPOSALS DELINEATED

'Practical Support' Needed

LD251032 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Political observer Lev Semeyko commentary]

[Text] The European aspect of nuclear disarmament holds a prominent place in the new Soviet proposals. The present approach contains some of the elements of the previous ones. For example, in the past too, the Soviet Union proposed ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, medium-range and tactical alike [as heard]. Similarly, when we were having talks with the Americans on medium-range nuclear weapons, we took into account the nuclear arsenals of Britain and France. And still the present Soviet approach greatly differs from the previous one. As it stands now, all the European medium-range missiles are viewed in the context of global and stage-by-stage nuclear disarmament. Emphasis is laid not so much on gradual reductions, as on the elimination of all the nuclear weapons on earth by the year 2000. The elimination procedure is arranged in such a way that not a single side and not a single nuclear state might, in any period, view itself at a disadvantage or its security unilaterally undermined.

Let us see how we should work with regard to the nuclear forces of Britain and France. All that is required of the British and French in the first stage, over a period of 5 to 8 years beginning this year, is to refrain from building up their strategic nuclear missiles. The Americans, during the same stage, would have to pledge not to supply its strategic missiles or medium-range missiles to London and Paris, including Trident-2 missiles to London. At the same time, the Soviet Union and the United States would reduce by one half the number of nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territories. Besides in the first 5 to 8 years, the Soviet Union would scrap all the SS-20 and SS-4 missiles deployed in the European zone, while the United States would eliminate its Pershings and cruise missiles deployed in Western Europe.

This gives obvious advantages to the British and the French. The Soviet and American nuclear potentials would become commensurate with those of Britain and France, and not a single Soviet medium-range missile would be targeted against either of the two countries.

In the second stage, to begin no later than 1990 and continue for 5 to 7 years, the other nuclear powers, Britain and France included, should begin to join in the process of nuclear disarmament. At first,they would pledge to freeze all their nuclear weapons and not to have any on the territory of other countries. After that, with the Soviet Union and the United States completing the 50 percent reductions of their corresponding weapons in the second stage, all the nuclear powers should do away with their tactical weapons, that is weapons with a radius of up to 1,000 km. In the same second stage, all the nuclear powers would stop testing nuclear weapons.

Will the security of Britain or France be undermined at that stage? Of course it will not. They would still retain their strategic nuclear forces at that stage. In other words, the Soviet Union will not mind if, within the framework of general and complete nuclear disarmament, Britain and France retain their strategic nuclear weapons for 10 and even more years.

Yet in the third stage, to begin no later than 1995, all the remaining nuclear weapons of all the nuclear powers would have to be scrapped by 1999.

There aren't any hidden tricks in the Soviet program of nuclear disarmament. It precludes any chance for anyone to obtain unilateral advantages. It represents a clearcut plan of joint and energetic efforts over a period of 15 years to rid our planet of nuclear weapons. The Soviet plan is a complex one, yet its backbone is to destroy nuclear weapons. How will London and Paris respond to it? Mere approval, if of course any official approval comes, is not enough. What is needed is active and practical support. If such support is provided, Europe will soon have neither SS-20's nor Euro-missiles nor United States-made Trident or any other nuclear weapons.

'Special Mission' for Europe

LD231724 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Vladimir Chernyshev commentary headlined "A Special Mission" and subheaded "The Role of Europe in the Disarmament Process"]

[Text] Moscow, January 23 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

In the program, which the Soviet Union has put forward with a view to removing the threat of an all-out war and which constitutes a many-sided and detailed complex of proposals, a considerable part of initiatives is addressed to Europe. And this is not a fortuity. It is precisely our continent, which is literally stuffed with military bases and tools of death, that has not become a much more explosive focus of the newest destruction weapons than the most refined science fiction writer of the past could imagine. At the same time it is precisely little Europe, which is too fragile to fight wars, that possesses unique historical experience in the positive solution of matters of detente. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference may serve as a concrete example of new mentality and political psychology in an approach to the problems of peace, cooperation and international detente.

That is why, alongside the USSR and the USA, that, setting an example to other nuclear powers must start the process of nuclear disarmament, Europe could assume a special mission in making a sharp turn toward the policy of peace. This mission is detente-building.

According to the Soviet proposals, the decision on complete elimination of medium-range missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zone, both ballistic and cruise missiles, would be implemented, as an initial step on the road of ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons, already at the first stage of the three-stage programme for complete elimination of nuclear arms in the world. At the same time, the United States should undertake not to transfer its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France should pledge not to build up their respective nuclear arms.

At the second stage, tactical nuclear weapons would first be frozen, and then destroyed and there would be a ban on the development of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles, whose destructive capacity is close to that of nuclear arms or other weapons of mass destruction. And, finally, the elimination of all remaining nuclear weapons would be completed at the third stage.

All this would enable West European countries to rid themselves of first-strike nuclear missiles being deployed in their territories, to reject the role of the Pentagon's "nuclear hostages" imposed on them by the United States, to remove forever the tendency of the worsening of the conditions of the European security threatening them now. The Gordian knot would thus be cut and the entire continent would heave a sigh of relief.

The Soviet Union suggested that alongside the elimination of mass destruction weapons, conventional armaments and armed forces should be subject to agreed upon reductions. Europe can make a great contribution and fulfil it in this aspect, too. The beginning to this can be set at the Vienna talks on the reduction of forces and armaments in central Europe. Use must be made also of the opportunities that appeared at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. The Soviet proposals to those forums provide weighty enough grounds for this. By the way, even the head of the U.S. delegation to the Stockholm Conference Robert Barry had to admit at a press conference in the State Department on January 22 that Mikhail Gorbachev had given a certain political impetus to that conference and that his call for a successful conclusion of the conference was an optimistic sign.

The European public, sane politicians in West European countries highly appreciate the opportunities offered by the Soviet programme, describe it as the most comprehensive initiative in the sphere of disarmament ever advanced by a great power. According to the French newspaper LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS, NATO experts arrive at the conclusion that the document contains a certain number of compromise proposals and innovatory ideas that merit attention.

It is now extremely important that West European countries should give a serious, well thought-out answer to the Soviet initiative. This answer must be based on a realistic appraisal of the situation in the world, must be imbued with real concern for peace in Europe and all over the world.

MBFR TALKS RESUME; OPPORTUNITY FOR ACCORD

Soviet Delegation Arrives

LD271639 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Vienna, January 27 TASS -- A delegation of the U.S.S.R. arrived here today to take part in a scheduled round of the talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. The Soviet delegation is lead by Ambassador Valerian Mikhaylov.

MBFR Agreement 'Possible'

AU271250 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 27 Jan 86 p 4

[Article by APN "historian and expert on central Europe" N. Petrov on the Vienna MBFR talks: "After the Latest Soviet Proposals: Outline of a Solution in Sight"]

[Text] Moscow -- The fact that virtually no practical results have been achieved so far at the Vienna MBFR talks is primarily due to one reason: The NATO countries have made the main goal of the negotiations the elimination of an alleged disproportion in favor of the Warsaw Pact countries in the reduction area as regards ground forces and the most important types of conventional arms. Proceeding from this position, they have demanded "asymetric reduction;" in other words, a much larger reduction of the socialist states' ground forces than NATO's. In the endeavor to get out the of the cul de sac and find opportunity to conclude at least a partial agreement, the socialist countries submitted new proposals on 14 February. This initiative offers actual opportunities to achieve, first of all, concrete results in order to reduce the excessive concentration of troops and arms in the heart of Europe. It draws attention especially to those aspects of the negotiations where even now a mutually acceptable solution is taking shape and can be achieved.

On 5 December 1985 the NATO countries submitted their counterproposals. These proposals are now being carefully studied by the socialist countries and naturally, they still need to be more specifically defined. Nevertheless, the outlines of a possible solution are more or less taking shape. Such a situation is unprecedented in the history of the Vienna negotiations. This is undoubtedly a hopeful sign. The agreement that is in the offing will naturally require the implementation of verification measures. However, it is obvious that they must be reasonable; in other words, that they must be in line with the commitments under the agreement and must not become a source of distrust and suspicion. Under no circumstances must such verification measures degenerate into reconnaissance work.

In this context attention should be especially focused on an important development in the position of the socialist countries that is mentioned in the statement by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev of 15 January. As far as compliance with the commitment to freeze the numerical strength of the forces is concerned, it has now been proposed to establish, in addition to the national technical means, control points which would observe the transfer or withdrawal of any troop contingents in the reduction area. This constructive new step makes it possible to overcome the deadlock over the question of verifying compliance with an agreement. The Soviet Union and its allies are thus practically demonstrating their efforts to achieve success at the Vienna negotiations. If the other side really also wants this, then 1986 could become a milestone for the Vienna negotiations, Gorbachev stressed.

NINTH CDE SESSION TO OPEN IN STOCKHOLM

Grinevskiy Remarks

LD271900 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Tomorrow in Stockholm a regular session, the ninth, of the Conference on Confience-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe opens. Taking part in our program is the leader of the Soviet delegation and roving ambassador, Oleg Alekseyevich Grinevskiy:

[Grinevskiy] The session opening tomorrow is perhaps one of the most crucial. The conference has chances for success, but there remains only just enough time for their realization. There is no small number of unresolved issues; for this reason the 15 January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has particular relevance for giving dynamism to the talks. It paves the way to resolving these unresolved issues.

Because it is a matter of raising confidence, the socialist countries, and other European states, want to better know and understand each other's intentions. For this it is necessary, in particular, to lower the threshold or providing information about large-scale land forces exercises compared with how this was envisaged in the Helsinki Final Act -- But the Soviet Union proposes giving information not only about land forces exercises, but also about navy and air force exercises. Of course the experiences of not only the last war, but also contemporary conflicts have shown what importance and often decisive significance air and sea strikes have had and what great damage they inflicted. But the United States and NATO are trying to reduce information to just the activity of land forces, cutting off the navy and air force.

Let us say straight that the conference literally got stuck on this issue, as they say -- it could not move in any direction. What can be done then? If there is no success for the moment in solving the issue as a whole, then why not do it in parts? Let's say, agree now on information about large-scale land forces and air forces exercises and transfer the issue of naval activity to the next stage of the conference. In such a way, the problem would not be removed, but tackled gradually, taking into account the security interests of all countries.

This is a just approach. It depends on the United States and NATO whether [the conference] continues to be locked on resolving this issue.

Zholkver Commentary

LD272329 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] The Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Rurope resumes in Stockholm tomorrow [28 January].

This will be the eighth [as heard] session of the conference, in which representatives of 33 European states and the United States and Canada are taking part. In the 2 years of its work, the forum in the Swedish capital has examined in detail the most varied aspects of European security. Meanwhile, it has become quite obvious that measures for trust in the military sphere will be able to be effective only if they are to be combined with major political actions to strengthen security on the Continent of Europe. At the end of the last round of the conference, the participants agreed to draft the outlines of a possible agreement. An important role in this direction is played by the draft submitted by the socialist states for a treaty with the NATO countries on mutual non-use of force and on maintaining peaceful relations. The socialist countries have also submitted a proposal for restricting the scale of military exercises in Europe and for notification of such exercises and major relocations of troops in general.

May I recall that at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva, both sides, attaching great importance to the Stockholm conference, stated their intention to promote its speedy and successful completion together with other states. But what do we see after Geneva? Thus far the United States has not responded to the USSR's call for an end to nuclear explosions, which would indisputably be a most important measure for mutual trust.

At the same time, the United States is staging major military maneuvers in various parts of the globe, from Honduras and South Korea to the FRG and the Mediterranean, which in fact are difficult to distinguish from troop deployments for commencing combat action.

Meanwhile, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement proposes constructive measures intended to create barriers in the path of the use of force and concealed preparation for war, be it on land, sea, or air. A considerable proportion of these measures concern Europe directly, the latter being called upon to play the role of the site for building detente. For it is in Europe, at the European conference in Helsinki, where the decision to hold the conference on measures for trust and security in Europe was also adopted and where tangible examples of a new way of thinking, a new political psychology in the approach to the most important problems of today's world have been provided. Our country is also making its contribution to the cause of strengthening peace, cooperation, and international trust at the Stockholm conference.

KARPOV, ISRAELYAN RECEIVE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GROUP

LD231508 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 23 TASS -- A meeting has been held today of the members of the Soviet delegation at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons with a delegation of representatives of the current international conference here of non-governmental organizations devoted to the International Year of Peace.

Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation, stressed the enormous fundamental significance of the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee containing a broad and concrete programme for the total elimination everywhere of nuclear weapons by the year of 2000 on condition of a ban on the development of space strike weapons.

It was said that the Soviet side will be invariably guided at the talks with the U.S. delegation in Geneva by that history-making document with the aim of the speediest attainment of mutually acceptable agreements on issues under discussion, proceeding from the conviction that it is precisely the USSR and the USA that should set an example for the other nuclear powers.

The representatives of non-governmental organizations said the participants in the conference treated with much attention both the results of the Soviet-American summit (?and the) new Soviet proposals contained in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15. In their opinion, the Soviet Union's new peace initiative gives a powerful mobilising impetus to the intensification everywhere of the struggle waged by world public for putting an end to weapons race on earth and preventing it in outer space, for eliminating the threat of a nuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind.

The day before, a numerous group of delegates to the conference visited the USSR permanent representation to the U.N. office in Geneva. They were briefed by Viktor Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, on the Soviet Union's policy in the field of disarmament and the new Soviet peace initiatives.

U.S. ACTIONS COUNTER NEW SOVIET PROPOSAL

PM271336 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jan 86 First Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Responsibility to the Peoples"]

[Text] It is 10 days since the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was made public. And the more we read its text, ponder its contents, and familiarize ourselves with the avalanche of comments on this document, the more clearly the truly historic, landmark significance of the comprehensive peace program set forth in it appears before us. At the complex and dangerous juncture to which the forces of militarism and aggression have now led the development of events in the international arena and under conditions when mankind is most acutely faced with the question "to be or not to be?", Moscow proposes to all the world's peoples the path to the future. To a future worthy of our civilization.

The large-scale package of Soviet peace initiatives and the major foreign policy actions of a fundamental nature on which the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Soviet Government adopted a decision at the beginning of the year are already known everywhere. The linchpin is the 15-year program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world. This is a problem of significance to all mankind. To solve it is to deliver the human race from destruction in the flames of a nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet initiative is not just an appeal, not just a delcaration. It indicates clearly delineated routes and guidelines and incorporates three organically linked stages which proceed one from the other and, in a number of their elements, penetrate each other, as it were. Specific times for realizing them have been defined, and ways have been outlined to reach mutually acceptable and strictly verifiable accords. It is perfectly obvious that no one will lose as a result of implementing the total elimination of nuclear weapons proposed by the Soviet Union. Everyone will gain by it.

To free our planet from the threat of nuclear destruction and to complete this process before the end of the present century, to enter the third emillennium without nuclear weapons -- this is the aim the Soviet Union sets before all the world's peoples. It goes without saying, however, that this aim can only be achieved given the mutual renunciation by the Soviet Union and the United States of the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. Peaceful space, not "star wars" -- this is the only real way to make nulcear weapons superfluous and reduce them to naught. In short, a ban on the deployment of strike arms in space is the only natural precondition for the liquidation of nuclear weapons.

Although the elimination of nuclear weapons constitutes the very essence of the comprehensive peace program advanced by the Soviet Union, it is nonetheless comprehensive because it also provides for other measures which, in themselves, are of major, fundamental significance. These include the closing of all channels for improving nuclear weapons through the total cessation of their testing, following the USSR's example; the removal of chemical weapons from states' arsenals; a ban on the creation of non-nuclear arms which approximate in terms of casualty effect to means of mass destruction; the activation of the entire existing system of talks in Geneva, Vienna, and Stockholm; measures to strengthen security in Asia; and an approach to resolving global problems which are being exacerbated all the time. This is why all mankind is showing such close interest in the Soviet program and this is why all sober-minded people so widely hail and approve it.

The Soviet Union has addressed to all peoples and states an ardent appeal to ensure a better world.

But this appeal is addressed primarily to the United States. Indeed, precisely the Soviet Union and the United States are the economically most powerful states in the world with the greatest military potential -- above all, nuclear missile potential -- and with the greatest political weight in the international area. Consequently, they bear special responsibility for the nature of world development, for its course and consequences. "The acuteness of the present moment," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, "leaves the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States and the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States no alternative but to grasp the great science of living together."

What has been Washington's reaction to the new Soviet initiatives? As distinct from the past, this time it has not rejected Moscow's proposals outright or hastily branded them with the stereotyped lable "propaganda." On the contrary, both the President and other official spokesmen of the U.S. Administration have been unable to deny the constructive nature of the Soviet program.

But, in speaking of the reaction on the other side of the ocean to the comprehensive peace program advanced by the Soviet Union, it would be wrong to maintain that it has been greeted there with open arms, as the saying goes. It is perfectly obvious that, forced to reckon with public opinion, the White House is resorting to a two-faced policy and is maneuvering. On the one hand, it proclams that the Soviet proposals "merit serious study," while on the other it continues to reject the appeal to subscribe to the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on all nuclear explosions and continues to step up preparations for "star wars."

Obviously inspired articles which, to put it mildly, cast doubt on the possibility of realizing the Soviet proposals in practice have begun appearing increasingly frequently in the U.S. mass media. It is possible to cite as an example an article by WASHINGTON POST commentator P. Geyelin. He claims that you cannot "pretend that the world can ever be totally rid of the threat of nuclear arms," and he denies the existence of any alternative to "the nuclear potential of deterrence." "The unavoidable truth is that there is no alternative," the commentator concludes his article.

It is not a question here of the stand taken by certain journalists. And not even just of the stand taken by particular U.S. politicians, whether Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, White House Press Secretary L. Speakes, or P. Buchanan, one of the President's leading advisers, who even in Washington has a reputation as being extremely right-wing and who continues even now to campaign for confrontation with the Soviet Union, declaring that the United States "is in a state of conflict with the Soviet Union all over the world." It goes without saying that such statements can in no way help to improve relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and do not tally with the "Geneva spirit." But we repeat, it is not just a question of them; the thing is the thing itself -- reader, please forgive the pun -- or, rather, real things.

These things are as follows. Official Washington, goaded on by the military-industrial complex, is still a prisoner of the elemental forces of the arms race which it unleashed and of the preparations for "star wars." Nuclear test explosions are continuing unabated on the Nevada range. Work on the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike weapons is being expanded. According to data in DEFENSE NEWS, the Lockheed missiles and space company has just received a contract to develop [razrabotka] an interceptor missile which is worth $350 million. Big orders from the Pentagon have also gone to other corporations involved in realizing the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" -- TRW, McDonnell Douglas, and others.

To rephrase the well-known expression, you might say that the Pentagon and those who are behind it are guided by the principle "spare no expense for catridges." And what cartridges -- nuclear ones! And what expense -- trillions!

According to the U.S. Defense Department's "Directives in the Defense Sphere for Fiscal 1985-1989," it is planned to spend $1,958.6 billion on building up U.S. military strength over the next 5 years, that is, very nearly $2 trillion!

One constantly encounters reports in the press of new strategic concepts and cannibalistic "scenarios" being drawn up by U.S. military-political snalysts. There is the new exposition of "naval strategy" prepared by Admiral J. Watkins, chief of U.S. naval operations. And there is the futurological study by one C. (Grey), who openly discussed what even the most inveterate militarists in the United States prefer to keep in profound secrecy. Here is a sample of the demands formulated and "substantiated" by (Grey). In his opinion, the U.S. tasks in 1995-2005 will consist of: first, "destroying Soviet nuclear forces"; second, "dominating in escalation"; and, third, acquiring the potential to "defend the homeland and to mobilize for victory under the conditions of this homeland sheltered behind walls." How can such a "scenario" be reconciled with the accord reached by the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva that nuclear war must never be unleashed and can have no winners?

And yet such totally wild ravings -- from the viewpoint of a sober-minded person -- are made the basis of planning for a further buildup of the might of the U.S. Armed Forces and for strengthening the U.S. military potential. It is not for nothing that the Pentagon envisages equipping the armed forces by the year 2000 with an additional 600 types of weapons and combat hardware created on the basis of the latest scientific achievements and increasing by more than 50 percent the number of army divisions and air force fighter units. What can one say about all these facts? The attempts by the U.S. military-political leadership to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union are illusory and impracticable. They have never led to success in the past, and will do so still less in the future. But they could inflame the situation still more and make the threat of world catastrophe still more palpable. Those who take this path do not want to be conscious of the measure of responsibility which history has placed on the Soviet Union and the United States, responsibility to mankind and for the future of mankind.

What is needed in our time is bold new approaches, new political thinking, and heightened awareness of one's responsibility for the people's destinies. All these qualities are possessed in full measure by the comprehensive peace program set forth in the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement of 15 January 1986. It is designed to ensure that mankind greets the year 2000 beneath peaceful skies and space, does not know fear of a nuclear, chemical, or any other threat of destruction, and is firmly confident of its own survival and of the continuation of the human race. Today the practical actions of leading politicians and of governments, above all, should be measured with the yardstick of responsibility. As is known, the Soviet Union has never held matters up. Is the United States conscious of its responsibility to the peoples?

SOVIET PROPOSAL TERMED A REALIZABLE 'DREAM'

LD271053 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 26 Jan 86

[Commentary by Fedor Burlatskiy, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political observer; from "The International Panorama" program]

[Excerpts] Hello comrades! Eleven days have passed since the statement by Comrade Gorbachev was published. Yet the wave of reaction to it does not decrease, but grows. Following the speeches by the leaders of various states, the discussion of our proposals was joined by the press, radio, and television in practically every country of the world. My attention was drawn to a phrase in one of the commentaries which reads: Gorbachev's dream, this appraisal is addressed to the idea of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and this appraisal is expressed not without some sympathy, but with some doubt, perhaps, as to the feasibility [realnost] of such a task.

It is too good, it says, to be believable. Is this a joke? The elimination of all nuclear arsenals numbering 55,000 warheads; the arsenals which belong to five great powers -- the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and China. It is some kind of a joke, to come to an agreement on the positions [soglasovas' pozitsii] of all these states and take into account each of their security interests? Individual elements, touching principally on the talks taking place in Geneva now, are generally taken from the statement on the 50-percent cut in strategic weapons, the intermediate decision on intermediate-range missiles, and the chemical weapons ban. Of course, the solution to these problems has great inherent significance. But why does the central idea -- the idea of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the whole world -- why is this idea left to one side?

No matter how complex this task is, no matter how difficult it may be to agree to the positions of the Soviet Union, the United States, and the other nuclear powers, we must all know where we are going and what kind of final goals we have. This kind of approach will help us agree on a state-by-stage intermediate solution.

However, I heard the word dream in this context -- in the context of the struggle against the nuclear threat -- way back in Geneva where I was during the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. One of the U.S. journalists told me that President Reagan spoke about his dream during the famous fireside conversation between the two leaders of our powers. And in fact, in one of his first speeches, after the meeting, President REagan spoke about this conversation; I quote: I explained, the President said, our Strategic Defense Initiative and our research program which envisages the possibility of creating defense systems which could, in the final analysis, defend all states from the threat of nuclear war. Mankind would at last cease to be prisoners of terror before each other. This is my dream, said the President.

So the leader of the United States, which was the first to create the atomic bomb and begin the arms race, now dreams of how to make his country safe -- and other countries as well, he says -- from the fear of nuclear weapons. How though? By creating even more fantastic weaponry? Is this a new idea? Maybe it is an original invention specifically for nuclear strategy which the ordinary human mind is not capable of comprehending? It is no such thing. The U.S. President was rightly told in Geneva: It is much easier to eliminate all nuclear weapons than to create space strike systems. Why spend tens of hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars and pile up mountains of space weapons alongside nuclear ones? Where is the sense in this?

Now the whole world, all nuclear and non-nuclear states, and all international public opinion have in front of them the Soviet plan to liberate the earth from nuclear weapons by the end of this century. It is indeed a concrete, balanced, and business-like plan; in which our proposals are clearly defined at each state of the whole process of nuclear disarmement. Is this a dream? Yes, if you like, it is a dream, but only in the same sense in which Herbert Wells, the famous fantasy writer, spoke of Lenin's dream of creating a new society on the ruins of bleeding Russia. You remember, of course, that Wells called Lenin the Kremlin dreamer. It can now be seen how beautiful a dream is when it sets noble aims and when it accords with the people's hopes. Such a dream blends with reality and serves as a reliable footbridge to tomorrow.

So our partners in the countries of the West [as heard] may not agree with all the elements of the proposed plan. To begin with, only the tasks of the first stage of disarmament will be solved. This will already be a major victory on the road to the final goal. Let them ponder once more the question where all the states targeting their aim of creating new types of weapons are. The dream of a space shield disintegrates when brough into contact with the plan for a stage-by-stage destruction of the whole nuclear missile potential.

MOSCOW TV'S 'STUDIO 9' ON GORBACHEV ARMS PROPOSAL

OW251127 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0657 GMT 25 Jan 86

["Studio 9" program, presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio; with Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Nikolay Ivanovich Yefimov, first deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA; and Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin, political observer of IZVESTIYA -- videotaped at the Cultural Palace auditorium of the Vladimir Ilich Machinery Plant in Moscow; individuals asking questions from audience identified by captions]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello comrades. We meet for our regular discussion on current problems in world politics. Our discussion is not being held in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center; we have come to the collective of workers of the renowned Vladimir Ilich plant in Moscow to answer your questions. We are sure you have many questions.

I shall begin by presenting participants in today's discussion, those who will answer your questions: Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Nikolay Ivanovich Yefimov, first deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA; and Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin, political observer of IZVESTIYA. Well, together we shall answer your questions today.

Our meeting is taking place during highly important days, on the eve of the 27th congress. You know that our country has now come out with initiatives of great significance, unprecedented initiatives. Never before has a realistic program been advanced for eliminating all nuclear weapons on earth. There have been common appeals concerning this; there have been dreams about this; but there has never been a realistic and stage-by-stage program strictly limiting the time. It covers a period of 15 years at the end of which nuclear arsenals must be destroyed. The statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has outlined this most important program and it has aroused great interest in the world.

I think that in the course of today's discussion, we shall manage to deal with the various aspects of this problem. Now, I think we should proceed straight ahead with our business, and I want you to begin by asking your questions. Please go ahead.

[A.I. Romanov, senior foreman] The Soviet people, our working class, unanimously support the entirety of the new foreign political initiatives outlined in the statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. This is our position, our direction. We know that the new historic initiatives of our party have been met with great satisfaction by hundreds of millions of people in the world. What was the reaction to our proposals in the White House? What was the reaction of the leaders of the leading capitalist countries?

[Zorin] Well, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, answer this question.

[Primakov] I shall try to reply, comrades, but there is no simple answer. If you look at what is happening in this connection in Western Europe and Japan, I think there is more scope for speaking about a positive attitude than there is in the United States. In Western Europe, a number of leaders have already appealed to the United States -- actually, this was also done by the Japanese leadership -- to very carefully analyze and display a very constructive attitude to the proposals. First to speak in the United States was President Reagan who said that on the whole, he views the proposals constructively. He added that never before has a single statesman, and he actually said it, come out with such proposals for eliminating nuclear weapons. At the same time, and immediately after Reagan spoke, representatives of the State Department and the Pentagon, who on the whole began expressing doubts about the new

spirit and the constructiveness of the proposals, started to advance their arguments against the proposals and specifically started to say that the United States will not give up its SDI; in other words, it will not give up preparations for nuclear... [Primakov pauses] "star wars," will not give up attempts to place strike weapons in space.

Others have said that the United States will not reply to our appeal for a moratorium on nuclear explosions, nuclear tests. I must say that it was possible to forecast such a reaction from the very beginning. I do not think our leadership has ever thought that this proposal would be some kind of magic wand with which it would be possible to immediately change the situation, that they would immediately, so to speak, stop to think the way they do and immediately take a totally different orientation in international politics. Nobody has ever thought this.

This is a very long affair, of course. It is a very long path to normalizing the international situation, a very long road. But I would like to quote an example about the SDI, the so-called "star wars."

According to available information, 1,500 corporations in the United States are already involved in this program. In this field, they obtain or will obtain tens of billions in profits. Some 26 billion has been allocated for this program for the 1984-89 period, a 5-year period. Naturally, these corporations will exert pressure on the government. They are the so-called military industrial complex which is manifesting itself in all its glory, so to speak. To think that under such conditions the U.S. leadership will immediately accept everything, take a completely different road, and give up what they have done in the past, I do not think any stake was ever placed on this as far I understand. Yet, it is perfectly clear that at the same time a favorable atmosphere for solving these problems is being created, and this atmosphere came into being with the Geneva meeting.

[V.N. Zhmotov, machinery repairman] Judging from everything, the SDI program is greatly complicating the problem of nuclear disarmament. I would like to know about U.S. public opinion on the proposal. It may not have been publicized there?

[Yefimov] You know, it is not possible to give a simple answer to this question. "It appears that there is not just one SDI program but several SDI programs in the United States. Reagan has one program; for him, the SDI program is a miracle. One of his biographers has even written that for U.S. President Reagan, the SDI program is almost the second coming of Christ. For U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger, the SDI program means something else. It is a wonderful opportunity, in his view, for wrecking all the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States which are being or could be held. For the military industrial complex, the SDI program means, what Yevgeniy Maksimovich has just said, huge profits, profits guaranteed for the coming 10, 20, 40, and 50 years. Finally, for the military, the SDI program means the possibility of inflicting the first strike on the Soviet Union. So this is one aspect, one position. Of course there are many Americans who understand perfectly well all the dangers of SDI. The tales we hear about SDI being only a protective shield, for only defense and nothing else, do not convince specialists most of all.

[A.V. Zorkin, engineer] Please tell me about the reaction of the PRC to the latest Soviet initiatives on nuclear disarmament?

[Bovin] Answering correspondents' questions, a representative of the PRC Foreign Ministry Press Department spoke on the issue of new disarmament proposals submitted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. He said: [Bovin reads from a piece of paper] the disarmament proposals Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev submitted on the eve of the fourth round of Soviet-U.S. disarmament talks contain something new. We shall have to examine these proposals further. Currently, the Soviet Union and the United States remain far apart on positions in some important aspects of disarmament. Here is the

last sentence: We wish that the Soviet Union and the United States will engage in serious talks and achieve progress.

Here is, formally speaking, the PRC reaction to Comrade Gorbachev's statement. If you expand it a little more, this is on the whole a positive reaction, and it indicates that if you take the whole range of international issues between us and the Chinese, there is a sufficient number of points of contact in world politics. Differing from the past, China now does not refuse to discuss disarmament problems. You know that China has announced that it will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. But in addition to this, in addition to the issues in which we and China in principle occupy similar positions, there is also a whole range of important political problems in which our positions continue to diverge. Our positions differ on problems such as the situation in Afghanistan, the situation in Cambodia and Vietnam, and a whole range of other problems. So this must also be taken into consideration when assessing Sino-Soviet relations, and despite these contradictions and complexities, we see that in the last few years -- and apparently you see it in our press -- that on the whole, there is a process. It is true that it is a slow and complex one, yet there is a process of normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations, especially in the economic and cultural fields so far and less so in the political field. But on the whole, I repeat, this process continues. It is desired that it be quicker, but it is going on, continuing despite the fact -- it is possible to say here -- that there are still many sufficiently complicated and difficult problems.

[V.T. Lyapin, machine operator] The development and testing of new types of nuclear and laser weapons is being rapidly intensified in the United States. In their latest speeches, President Reagan and secretary of State Shultz, replying to the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, kept silent on the issue of space weapons. In this connection, I would like to know what is the relation between the nonmilitarization of space, which we firmly advocate and the proposals we submitted for the total destruction of nuclear weapons in the world.

[Zorin] Nikolay Ivanovich, please.

[Yefimov] There is a most direct connection. In order to answer your question, I shall speak very briefly about the SDI although the SDI issue deserves an entire 'Studio 9' program. What is SDI? Imagine that above our heads, as they think, there are several hundred, almost a thousand space platforms suspended in orbit, and these platforms are saturated with missiles, electromagnetic guns, lasers, and hydrogen bombs which feed [nakachivat] these lasers. All this equipment is controlled by computers, and the computers, if anything should happen, will give orders within 400 seconds from the moment computers, not people, decide that something alarming has happened. This is one aspect.

The other aspect is that while creating its program for space strike weapons, the United States is simultaneously speeding up the development and modernization program, the creation of new and the modernization of old nuclear weapons. Thus, we cannot speak just about SDI. We must always speak about SDI together with the 22 programs for the creation of new nuclear weapons now underway.

We have already heard many times from Washington people saying that the SDI is purely defensive in nature. Now what are they saying: I will read a statement by U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger, in an interview with the French weekly L'EXPRESS. Here is what he said quite frankly: If a program of this sort is first developed by the Russians, an extremely dangerous situation will take shape in the world. The nuclear means of deterrence of the United States, Britain, and France would amount to nothing and nothing could hinder a successful first strike by the Russians.

The fact that insidious aims are always attributed to us in the West is now new, but let us dwell on these words. Now what if the opposite were to occur, if the

United States creates this system first and deploys it in space? Then whose nuclear means, using Weinberger's words, will lose all meaning and amount to nothing? Who will then acquire the possibility of making the first strike? As you can see, the aim remains the same: military superiority and the possibility to attack the Soviet Union with impunity.

What is it then that currently bothers the United States, Washington? In creating this shield, of course they do not know how reliable it will be, how many missiles it will stop in case a retaliatory strike becomes necessary, and how many it will miss. You can imagine that with the current numbers of missiles on both sides, even if only 1 percent of those launched gets through, it would still be a catastrophe for the United States, not to mention a nuclear winter.

This is why they are seeking a way out of this stalemated position. This defensive shield, as they call it, needs some assistance, assistance in reducing the number of missiles that in case of retaliation will collide with their shield. How can this number of missiles be reduced? Talks need to be held with the Soviet Union and a reduction of our missiles must be achieved. The SDI remains, and say our missiles will be halved, and so it will now be twice as easy for this defensive shield. Thereby the opportunity for an attack on the Soviet Union increases.

A question arises: How can this be? After all, did not the leaders of both states agree in Geneva that the arms race in space cannot be permitted? They did agree; it is a matter of record: the arms race in space cannot be permitted. But in commenting on these seemingly very simple words the Americans are being crafty, cunning, and it could even be said that they are being dishonest. This is why we are making a quite categoric demand: If we are to conduct matters in a serious way and if we seriously pose the question of eliminating nuclear arms and all carriers of these arms, then let us hold honest talks and refrain from creating any space shield.

[Primakov] Life links these two questions. We are not linking them artificially, and here is why life links them; that is, because as has already been noted, not all 100 percent of the missiles -- and the Americans admit this -- will be liquidated even if they succeed in establishing the SDI. Many scientists reject the possibility of this success, but even if they succeed, a certain number of missiles will fly, and they propose the SDI as some kind of instrument of deterrence. But this is not so, for if the SDI is created, then each side will strive to increase the percentage of those missiles that will nevertheless get through the SDI. And this will result in a headlong arms race. This is what we are talking about.

[Zorin] You wanted to ask a question, please.

[Yu.V. Aleksandrov, fitter-assembler] What arguments against introducing a moratorium on nuclear tests are being made in Washington?

[Yefimov] I would mention two arguments. The first is the favorite argument in Washington and in the West in general. This argument says that underground nuclear tests are very difficult to detect with the national means available. It is very easy to confuse them with earthquakes, various movements of the earth's crust, and God knows what. Therefore, on-site verification [proverka] is essential.

We are also interested in not being deceived by anyone if we agree to a moratorium. We are also interested in reliable and effective control. We have always been convinced, are convinced now, that the national means are quite sufficient to detect everything. Nevertheless, we have proposed on-site inspection [inspektsiya]. So this favorite argument is no longer valid. Now a response is necessary.

The second argument: I would call the second argument the Weinberger argument. It is as follows: The Russians have carried out such an enormous number of tests -- I am citing Weinberger -- that they can permit themselves a moratorium. I am now citing figures of the Swedish Institute of World Problems: As of the beginning of last year, the United States had conducted 772 nuclear explosions and the Soviet Union 556. This is 200 fewer. Therefore, this position is insincere of course.

Once more, the time for words has passed.

[Bovin] But they have a third argument, a more serious one. They simply say: We must test new weapons; that is all. We have this, that, and the other programs. They are all on the drawing board, and we cannot drop them. We must test these weapons. This, I would say, is their major argument. Besides, it is related to the "star wars" program because the X-ray laser -- well, it may or may not be because much remains unclear -- is charged with the aid of a thermonuclear explosion, not a large one. Now, these explosions are currently being perfected with underground tests at Nevada, and they must provide the intense X-rays for the laser. So there is this argument: We must conduct our tests because we have new programs. And it can be added: If the tests are not carried out then the reliability of what is already stockpiled lessens because according to all the rules, one must every now and then pull one or two warheads from the stockpile and explode them to test the condition of the current series.

So, you have these purely military reasons. But our logic in this is that, well, we have a similar situation; we also have our programs, and we also have weapons stockpiled that need periodic checks. But our proposal is that we, too, will not do this. However, unfortunately, so far they have not recognized this logic of reciprocity although generally, the pressure from all sides on the Americans is extremely great now, particularly when it comes to prohibiting weapons tests.

[M.I. Batova, laboratory chief] We have not conducted nuclear tests since August last year, and we have now announced a 3-month extension of the moratorium. In the meantime, the United States continues to conduct these tests. Could this put us at a disadvantage against the United States?

[Yefimov] Of course this danger exists. Of course our restraint is fraught with this danger, and we cannot display it forever.

[Primakov] Unilaterally.

[Yefimov] Yes, unilaterally. Nevertheless, comrades, the fact that we extended the moratorium is, I think, an example, a very powerful example, if you will, of a new thinking in politics. Of course, if we follow the logic of the arms race, then we must have an eye for an eye. They do something, we respond in kind. We have not responded in kind, and I think there is great wisdom in this and courage, if you will, and I repeat, a new thinking because the stakes in the struggle for peace are too great now. It could be that now, you understand, currently, when there is a chance to advance, albeit a small one, when there is finally a chance to get rid of nuclear weapons, then probably when compared to this chance, even if it is small, these dangers which really do exist because we have undertaken another moratorium, the opportunities that are contained in the gamble are probably stronger.

[Bovin] A safety factor still exists, so there can be a moratorium.

[Yefimov] We have thereby given the United States another opportunity to think, to weigh things, and if you will, to give its politicians a chance to gather courage. Courage is really needed to support a moratorium under U.S. conditions and to go against the military industrial complex. Everyone is waiting for a response. In the words of a poet, give me straight answers to accursed questions. The questions have been posed now by our moratorium.

[Zorin] Of course, it was not easy to adopt this decision, but it will also be difficult for Washington to reject our proposal. Nevertheless, if it does this, as some leading politicians are saying in Washington, then the political price Washington will have to pay for refusing to follow such an example will be extremely high.

[N.B. Mayorova, new equipment bureau chief] Apparently, the "star wars" program demands colossal expenses. My question is: It is known that the debt of the developing countries to the capitalist countries amounts to several hundred billion dollars. What will happen to the economies of capitalist countries if the developing countries fail to pay their debts?

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, this is an interesting question.

[Primakov] Yes, it is an interesting question, but it seems to me that there will be no automatic crash of the capitalist economy, of course. We are talking about a hypothetical situation, a situation that can arise theoretically. I do not think that all these 100 debtor countries, and primarily the main debtors, will refuse to pay their debts. They are paying their debts, although it is very difficult.

Currently, they are paying about $120 billion annually, including interest on the credit received. Of course, many banks would suffer in this hypothetical or theoretical situation in which they all refuse to pay. Banks usually receive subsidies from governments. But then, it will not be the banks that suffer most because they do not have their own funds. The investors will suffer, and that is an enormous number of people.

This is one aspect, but I would like to draw your attention to another aspect that is extremely important. It lies in the fact that in extracting itself from this situation, in attempting to adapt and adjust to it, the capitalist world and the developed capitalist countries want to extricate themselves at the expense of the periphery of the world capitalist economy, at the expense of the less developed and developing countries, the debtor countries themselves. They tie down these countries, force them to further integrate with their economic system, and so forth, and they lay the burden on their shoulders.

[Zorin] Please proceed.

[Kh.A. Kutsidi, engineer] Soon after the Geneva meeting, a number of prominent Washington officials started making contradictory statements which actually contradict the agreement at Geneva. Comrade Primakov has now mentioned the statements by some of these leaders. Will U.S. leaders now use the Geneva meeting as a shield and intensify the arms race and at the same time refer to the fact that there is an agreement?

[Primakov] Well, this is serious question. You have raised a very serious question. It indicates that both the workers and other representatives of our society have certain anxieties about the fact that after Geneva, calls for increasing the arms race and so forth started to be heard in the United States at very high positions. What can be said in this connection.

Indeed, they might try to create a screen over the arms race. This is obvious. There are forces wanting to do this. But, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in Geneva, we are not simpletons, we see this, and we shall do our utmost to prevent this screen. We will make use of really serious, political approaches to solve a whole range of problems.

Comrades, it must be stated most emphatically, it is in no way a matter of us ceding or losing any of our positions. This is not the case. We are not talking about this and it is absolutely not the aspect of the matter.

The point is that we are using the reserves we still have in our position, and which have not been used before. We have talked here about verification. Think about the tremendous reserve that has now been put to use in our policy, has been used by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Previously, the United States always said: We are not in favor of signing any agreements because the Soviet Union allegedly is a closed society, and it will not be possible to verify what happens in the future.

But now we tell them that we are ready for any kind of verification if we can sign an agreement with them. This is a definite philosophy of verification if we sign an agreement. If we do not sign an agreement, then therecan be no verification at all because we cannot allow verification over the arms race, that would be elementary espionage. If you come with us to a common conclusion and sign an agreement with us, let us institute verification. We are interested in this matter no less than you, we tell them, because we were the ones who were suddenly attacked by Nazi Germany. We are interested even to a greater extent than you in definite and reliable verification.

The use of the reserve we have in our position, reserve not used before, has already led to really tremendous changes in public opinion. Let us see what the Americans will say now.

The statement says plainly that we are ready for practically any kind of verification, including site inspection in the ban on nuclear weapons. We have announced that in the destruction of chemical weapons, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement says, at a predetermined time we are ready to declare the locations of all the industrial complexes producing chemical weapons and proceed with the destruction of these capacities and stocks of chemical weapons; we will then allow obligatory bilateral site inspections. What will the American say now? We shall see. What will they say? In the past they said they could not go ahead because of lack of verification.

[S.A. Mitina, engineer] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement speaks about the need to eliminate chemical weapons. It is known that even the Nazis did not use them. Why is the issue so acute today.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich has already started answering this question a little. I shall continue. First of all, I want to say that this question has a long history. The issue of whether Nazi Germany would use chemical weapons was a very important issue in World War II. I would like to remind comrades, it is important now, that then, there were skeptics who said that it was not possible to prevent the use of chemical weapons, science had created this kind of weapon and they would be used without fail. We know that chemical weapons were not used on a large-scale during World War II and that even the Nazis did not dare to use them. They did not dare because a certain situation had been created in the world; they did not dare because they feared retaliation.

At any rate, from today's point of view, in our nuclear age, this is an important lesson of history which shows that wrong and harmful work is being done by those propaganda forces in the West which try to instill pessimism in people in connection with a ban on nuclear arms, alleging that this is not possible. Talking about the essence of your question, it has to be said that despite the fact that most countries signed the Geneva convention banning the use of chemical weapons, the danger exists. The Pentagon is not hiding its plans for using chemical weapons in war and is developing new types of chemical weapons. In particular, they are talking about binary chemical weapons, which is a new type of such weapons. We know that this is not just preparation. In the not distant past, Americans did use toxic substances in battle conditions. We remember vietnam. Consequently it is an important problem which continues to worry the international community. One of the elements of the complex program outlined by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is the question of also eliminating chemical weapons, together with other types of mass destruction weapons. This is an important element of the complex program, and it is not just a simple appeal; it is

just a good wish, but as it has already been said here, we are offering specific measures with specific verification.

This proposal has met with very great support and interest in the world, yet Washington has not stated any clear position in this connection. In the world, careful attention is being paid to what Washington's position will be on this important issue. And so, I beg you, please.

[R.V. Serova, engineer] Please tell us now to interpret the statements of Washington leaders when they speak about a nuclear war being impossible while they continue the arms race.

[Bovin] The point is that there is a kind of logic in the very military industrial complex. There is a logic in the development of U.S. military strategic thought.

At the theoretical level, at the level of scientific studies of the problem, Americans, like us, generally understand sufficiently well that it is not possible to win a nuclear war, that there can be no victors in it, that the one who begins first will perish second; that is all there is to it. It is understandable at the abstract level. But if you move to another level and see what U.S. generals say, they are still trying to invent some strategy that would enable them to solve the problem of squaring the circle, that would make it possible for them to find rational methods for conducting a nuclear war which in essence is an irrational phenomenon. And this inner contradiction, comrades, generally has an effect on the positions of our American partners.

Here is their assessment of our latest statement. Yes, they say, it is a very interesting statement, it must ... [Bovin pauses] there are constructive elements, it must be studied carefully. But unfortunately, I see the matter differently. When the matter is about concrete things, the other aspect of their position comes into play, and they say specifically, we cannot ban the tests because of this or that reason; we cannot ban chemical weapons because of this or that reason; third; fourth; fifth. That is the contradictory position, agreement in some general principles and approval of the very approach. The Americans say we are also in favor of reducing and destroying nuclear weapons. But in addition to this kind of general statement, in every specific case this general agreement melts some concrete no, no, no, and no which we are tired of hearing.

The general distrust existing between us and the Americans is hindering agreement, and so we have a vicious circle. There is no confidence because the arms race is going on, and the arms race is continuing because there is no confidence. The statement made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is precisely directed at crushing this vicious circle with radical proposals and still finding a way out of the situation. But you must understand that only 50 percent depends on us formally speaking, and 50 percent depends on the Americans. Frankly speaking, I think -- although it is that rare occasion on which I would like very much to be wrong -- that while the current administration is in the White House in the United States, I can hardly see us agreeing on some major issues with the Americans. The factions of the American bourgeoisie now in power in the United States and whose interests are represented by Reagan will hardly agree to reducing or slowing the arms race because of their material interests. Naturally, we shall continue to implement our line because as it has been correctly said by my comrades, if there is even the slightest chance, it is the task of the politicians to use this chance. Even if there is no chance, it is the task of the politicians to create such a chance because the stakes are very high, very high. We are talking about the life and death of humanity. This is the problem, and here, in order to prevent such an end, we shall naturally spare neither efforts, funds, nor energy, and we shall do our utmost, and we shall even do the impossible in order to ensure a different outcome.

TEXT [Primakov] You know the difference between a pessimist and an optimist. They say that a pessimist is a well-informed optimist. Well, Aleksandr Yavgenyevich is a very well-informed man. Yet, I cannot fully agree with his pessimistic and one-sided assessment of what will happen. But of course, with the Americans it is a most difficult matter.

[Bovin] With the current administration, I say.

[Primakov] It is a most difficult matter to agree with the Americans in general, and with the current administration it may be even more difficult than with any other one. But at the same time, it is not as if we are attempting to just make use of the slightest chance. We are conducting a real policy with hope for actually achieving some kind of breakthrough; there will be some breakthrough.

[Zorin] I would also like to express an opinion somewhat different to Aleksandr Yevgenyevich's opinion. The matter of course is that a very big role is played by the circumstances outlined by Aleksandr Yevgenyevich. Both the interests of the military complex and the sentiments of the people who are in the Washington administration today are political realities, and we should not close our eyes to them.

Now, let us ask ourselves a question. Did our specialists, you, and I consider a Soviet-U.S. summit practicable or possible say 2 or 3 years ago? No, it looked...

[Primakov, interrupting] And with a positive outcome.

[Zorin] Yes, and with a positive outcome. It looked unrealistic. Nonetheless, the meeting in Geneva took place and had considerable results. In my opinion, this is because in politics, there are first of all both subjective and objective circumstances; and second, circumstances in the given concrete situation can outweigh the interests of even such powerful circles as the military industrial complex.

I am convinced that the leaders of the military industrial complex opposed the Geneva meeting. We know how at the last moment Weinberger attempted to put sticks in the spokes of this meeting by publishing, by allowing that letter, we can say frankly a provocative letter, to leak out. In the letter addressed to the President, he opposed any agreements with the Soviet Union.

Of course, any further advances in the cause of finding ways to agreement and points of contact with this administration will be very difficult. Of course a very acute struggle will be waged in Washington. We can see it now. They use one tone in the White House, a somewhat different tone in the State Department, and a completely different tone in the Department of Defense. An internal struggle is underway there, but it seems to me that those objective circumstances, the existing realities of today, present the opportunity for progress not only if the Washington administration is replaced; they also give us the opportunity to implement our program and to implement, to put forward, such large-scale programs with the assumption that they are both realistic and not necessarily only after a certain period of time.

[Bovin] I will be very happy if Valentin Sergeyevich's forecast is justified. I will be very happy if this occurs.

[Yefimov] Of course, it is pleasant to do business with an administration that is intelligent, that possesses a high sense of historic responsibility. It is pleasant. But where is the guarantee that the next administration, the 1988 version, will be better? It could be worse.

[Bovin] There is no guarantee, and that is the crux.

[Yefimov] It seems to me that we simply cannot permit ourselves to wait, and the historic experience of Soviet-U.S. relations indicates that we should not wait.

I think we should not count on the next administration being easier and simpler to deal with. It might be that way.

We and you, comrades -- in fact, I wanted to look at the problem from a different angle -- can rely only on ourselves. It is no coincidence that the new edition of the draft party program says that the fact that we have achieved strategic parity with the United States is an enormous achievement of our people. It is indeed enormous.

Diplomacy engages in its task. It can make some things better, other things worse. However, in the long run, our scientists, our engineers, and you the working class determine the nature of our relations. It is no coincidence that the Americans are now following with great concern how we are beginning the reconstruction of our economy and our life and how we are accelerating the social and economic development of our country. They are watching.

[G.K. Belov, laboratory chief] In recent months and even days, U.S. actions have heightened tensions around Libya, in southern Africa, and Latin America. Tell us please, what influence can this have on solving the problem of reducing and eliminating nuclear arms?

[Primakov] Well, you know that the question of regional conflicts of course is related to the problem of normalization of the international situation and confidence between states. There is no doubt that if acts of interference into the internal affairs of other countries were stopped and if there was no support for antipopular regimes in a number of countries, this would lead to normalization and would generally promote the solution of problems relating to ending the arms race and those relating ultimately to the elimination of nuclear arms.

But at the same time, one question cannot be substituted with another. On the eve of the Geneva meeting, the Americans attempted to substitute these two questions, and during the talks in Geneva, they constantly tried to drag the question of regional conflicts to the fore and to place the question of arms reduction to the rear. At the time, Reagan came out with a very dubious formula that supposedly confidence between us does not exist because of these regional conflicts and not because of the arms race. But this formula is absolutely incorrect. At Soviet insistence, at the insistence of Comrade Gorbachev, the question of arms reduction was made the key issue. General attention was drawn to it, and all efforts in Geneva were concentrated on its solution. This was the main point. Generally, this major problem remains today, and the survival of human civilization depends on it.

Another thing I would like to say is that if questions of reducing arms were solved, this too would have a most radical influence on normalizing the international situation and would promote the elimination of very many conflict situations.

[A.S. Chuvin, section foreman] What likelihood is there that the United States will decide to make a direct attack on Libya, and what would be the reaction of Arab states to this?

[Primakov] It is hard to guess. But nevertheless, it seems to me that it is very unlikely that the United States will employ its armed forces against Libya on any large scale.

It is already losing a lot with its Libyan campaign, literally. A few days ago, there were reports, rather an analytical commentary carried by REUTER. It said that the Americans were losing in every Arab country as a result of their pressure on Libya. They are losing in the Muslim world too....

[Bovin, interrupting] The same thing is occuring in the West.

[Primakov] Yes, Western Europe, in fact, did not support the economic sanctions. I do not think that under these conditions, the Americans will initiate any kind of direct armed intervention, although this cannot be ruled out completely of course.

[V.P. Pashchenko, shop chief] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has often stressed the idea of the need for new thinking in world politics. Could you describe this in greater detail?

[Zorin] This question is very serious, and in fact, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in recent months raised the question several times of the need for new thinking among politicians and statesmen with whom great responsibility lies. Now, I would like to begin my reply to your question with a description of an episode that occured 30 years ago.

It was the last interview given by one of the greatest scientists of our time -- and not only of our time -- by the author of the theory of relativity, Albert Einstein. A journalist visited the gravely ill Einstein and asked him the following question: At this stage in the development of mankind, at this stage in the development of man's spirit and man's knowledge, mankind has found itself capable of delving into the innermost secrets of nature, particularly into the secrets of the atomic nucleus. At the same stage of its intellectual development, this very mankind is incapable of protecting itself from the consequences of its own knowledge. How can this incongruity, this paradox be explained?

Einstein replied as follows: Do not construe my reply as a joke. I am saying this in all seriousness. The reply to your questions lies in the fact that the science of physics, despite all its complexities, is a considerably simpler matter than the science of politics. This is why mankind has advanced in it.

This was said 30 years ago. Since then for 30 years mankind has been living in the nuclear age under conditions where the hopelessness of such a lag, of such a gulf between people's scientific knowledge and political thinking, has become absolutely clear.

In his statement published the other day, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed that it was time to reject stone age thinking according to which the main concern was to find the biggest club or the heaviest stone. And really, who was threatened by this stone and club? The people in the neighboring cave. The atomic club threatens the existence of human civilization. Under these conditions it is naturally necessary to reject many political notions of mankind's history on which statesmen relied for many centuries.

It is necessary to learn to reason on the basis of existing political realities. It is necessary to learn to reason not only on the basis of narrowly understood national egoistical interests but to also understand that the interests of other countries should be taken into consideration, to seriously consider the interests of other countries. It is necessary to learn to conduct affairs in such a way as not to strive for superiority over another country, not to strive to outwit or deceive it. What was acceptable in past centuries is no longer applicable under conditions where the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe, of thermonuclear suicide, hangs over mankind. Completely new statesmen with new thinking, thinking that corresponds with the realities of our age, are essential.

It seems to me that the document that we have just read, Comrade Gorbachev's statement which contains major and unprecedented proposals, an entire program which, if it is adopted, will give mankind the opportunity to enter the next century having rid itself of the fear of a thermonuclear catastrophe, is the most vivid practical example of this kind of new thinking that corresponds with the realities of today.

[Bovin] This is an interesting issue, and I would like to say a few words. Previously people were killed, people perished, states fell, civilizations died, but there was always a guarantee of a future. Wars took place and maybe 100 people or a million died, but history did not end. The future was guaranteed. People always proceeded from this. It was possible to kill a man, but mankind was immortal. This, I would say, was an underlying premise of all our previous history.

Now we have approached and entered into a completely and fundamentally different age. Now the underlying principle of the situation, the situation that demands the new thinking about which Valentin Sergeyevich spoke, lies in the fact that mankind has acquired the technical means to possibly commit suicide. Therefore, we do not have a guaranteed future; now it has become necessary to fight for it.

And it is precisely the statement which we have discussed at such length here today that is a practical policy aimed at ensuring that we still have a future, that our children and grandchildren have a future, that mankind does not destroy itself in a thermonuclear catastrophe. This new political reasoning which we have been speaking about here is needed for that.

[Primakov] I would like to try to sum up this new political reasoning, about which Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke, in three points: The first point is the dialectic of the division of the world into two parts, the socialist and the capitalist parts which each develop in accordance with their own laws, and the existence of a unified world. This unity of the world is manifested today not only in the fact that everyone is interested in solving problems common to mankind such as the liquidation of hunger, the search for fundamentally new sources of energy, the struggle to preserve the environment, and so forth, and not only because each of these systems is linked economically with one another, but because the problem of survival is real for everyone, as has already been mentioned here. That is the first point.

The second point, it seems to me, is acknowledgement of the objective interests of all states and at the same time a search for fields where these interests coincide as well as actions directed toward ensuring that they do coincide somewhere. In this regard I think that what Comrade Gorbachev said in Geneva is of very great significance. Addressing the United States, he said that any restriction of your security is not only detrimental to you but is also not in our interests, not in the interests of the Soviet Union. This matter needs serious thought. This means that a large sphere exists, a sphere primarily involving security.

Of course we have contradictory, opposite interests. They have a capitalist world, we a socialist one. But in one sphere, the sphere of security, these contradictions must not be considered absolute. Some fields of coincidence must be sought, and actions must be undertaken which combine these often contradictory interests.

The third point was also emphasized by Comrade Gorbachev. He said, and this is also really an element of the new thinking, that under no circumstance can the objective processes occuring in various countries of the world -- objective social and economic and political processes -- all be viewed through a prism of Soviet-U.S. confrontation. When something occurs in Nicaragua, for example, or in the Middle East, the easiest thing to say is that it is the hand of Moscow which is attempting to install anti-American regimes. As a matter of fact they become anti-American as a result of U.S. support for the counterrevolution. This cannot all be viewed in this way. The objective reasons which lead to various changes should be seen. These are the three points I wanted to make.

[Zorin] Well, insofar as it is time to end our discussion, it remains for me to thank you for your very interesting questions, to thank our television viewers for their attention, and to thank you for taking part in this discussion and to express the

hope... [changes thought] I understand that we did not reply to all the questions that interest you. Our television viewers write to us about their interest in many things. This is not our last edition of the Studio 9 program, so I would like to bid you farewell, until the next one. Thank you.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD262053 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 26 Jan 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, TASS political observer; Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, a member of the editorial collegium of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA; and Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator]

Gorbachev Proposal

[Text] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! The new Soviet program for the step-by-step reduction of nuclear armaments and ultimately for their complete elimination which was set out by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his statement of 15 January has with no exaggeration attracted universal attention in the world. The basic points contained in this document continue to occupy the main space on the pages of the world's major press organs. This subject features in the statements and pronouncements of eminent state and public figures from different countries.

[Tsoppi] This subject has virtually pushed into the background all other problems in the international situation. I would like to draw attention to the latest issue of TIME magazine which makes this very point. This very noteworthy article is entitled: Farewell to Arms. It says that the Soviet Union has called for the complete elimination of nuclear missiles, warheads, bombs, and other weapons in our world. This was not put forward as some kind of vague objective for the future. The Soviet leader has formulated a fairly detailed three-step plan, which has to be implemented by the end of this century.

[Charikov] Yes, Viktor Aleksandrovich, this plan really is very thorough and very specific. It lists the measures which have to be carried out at each of the five [as heard] stages. But I would like to suggest that today we concentrate on one of the components, on one of the parts of this plan -- a component which in my view is particularly important. I am talking about the decision of the Soviet Union to extend the moratorium on underground nuclear explosions by a further 3 months. I use the word extend because this moratorium has been in operation since 6 August. This is a very memorable date, indeed, it is the date of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

[Grigoryev] It was the 40th anniversary.

[Charikov] So the Soviet moratorium, the unilateral moratorium on all types of nuclear tests, was in operation from 6 August to 31 December.

[Tsoppi] But the United States did not respond to our proposal that they join in this moratorium.

[Charikov] Quite right. So the Soviet Union, attaching enormous importance to this very issue of ending the testing of nuclear weapons as one of the radical ways of halting the further improvement of nuclear weapons and creating new varieties, well, the Soviet Union decided within the framework of this new program to extend the period of its own unilateral moratorium. I would like to return to some extent to the history of the testing of nuclear weapons in general. The date 16 July 1945 is regarded as the beginning of the nuclear era, the era of the atom intended to serve the aims of destruction. The first nuclear device was detonated on that day at the population center of Alamogordo in the state of New Mexico. It was detonated and tested. And on

6 August, that is to say literally less than a month later, it was already used against Japan. The bomb was dropped on Hiroshima.

[Tsoppi] It was not simply used against Japan, which was waging war, but against Japan's peaceful cities, against completely innocent people.

[Charikov] It has been calculated that throughout all the years that have passed since then, more than 1,500 nuclear explosions have been carried out in the world. Karl Fischer, Austria's representative at the United Nations, put it very aptly when he said that this was 1,500 times more than was necessary. No doubt his thinking was that it would have been possible to be limited to one test and to go no further in the development. But let's return to the political side of this issue. The Soviet Union has become the initiator, or, if you like, the main protagonist in the campaign for a ban on all nuclear tests. The result of talks and efforts that lasted for many years was the signing in Moscow in 1963 of a treaty on a partial ban on nuclear weapons [as heard] in three spheres -- in the air, in outer space and under water. The representative of three powers -- the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain -- signed this document. Currently, 113 of the world's states have joined in this treaty, that is to say, they have effectively become participants in it. Even at the time of the preparation of the Moscow treaty, the Soviet Union insisted on the inclusion of a point banning underground nuclear explosions. At that time, however, neither the United States nor Great Britain were willing to raise this issue, much less discuss it.

[Tsoppi] To this day, they are still frightened of this issue being raised for some reason.

[Charikov] Quite right. Nevertheless, upon the initiative, once again upon the initiative of the Soviet Union, talks were started in 1977 on this very issue of banning underground nuclear tests. Things did not go badly overall, and, as the historic documents show, sometime around the summer of 1980 a draft treaty was ready in rough form. However, quite unexpectedly, talks with the United States were broken off. Why? If one looks at the international situation at that time, in those years, I recall first and foremost the so-called two-track decision of NATO. That decision was made in 1979. What it amounted to was this: to saturate Western Europe with U.S. medium-range missiles, nuclear missiles. This action could not in any way correspond to the very subject of the talks, the tripartite talks on banning nuclear weapons tests. No doubt this was one of the reasons why, to begin with, the United States broke off the talks and later refused to continue them. What's more, if you noticed this, they did so unilaterally. The Soviet Union comes out unilaterally in favor of banning nuclear weapons; it introduced a moratorium that began on 6 August of last year, and extends the period for which it operates; while the United States, also unilaterally, overturns all these efforts.

[Grigoryev] Moreover, given that we have mentioned history, given that we are now talking about the fact that we have introduced a moratorium on two occasions, to begin with we declared the moratorium and then we extended it for 3 months -- there arises a natural and perfectly legitimate question: What then about the United States? This question is being asked primarily in the United States itself. Americans are asking why we have to continue carrying out nuclear explosions if the Soviet Union has stopped. Very different kinds of people are asking this question: politicians, what they refer to as the man in the street in America...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] And public organizations, mass public organizations.

[Grigoryev] Yes, certainly.

[Charikov] And the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee voted in favor of a resolution calling on Reagan to resume these talks, which were broken off in 1982.

[Grigoryev] Without doubt the Soviet program that was put forward in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, which proposes other measures besides the moratorium in the disarmament field, without doubt this has produced a tremendous impression primarily in the United States. I would like to return to the magazine that was quoted by Viktor Aleksandrovich, TIME magazine, and to quote a few lines from it where it talks about the link between the arms race on earth and the arms race in space which the United States is planning. What does the continuation of nuclear explosions mean? It means in fact going over to the further buildup of preparations for "star wars" -- is that not the case? In other words everything is intertwined.

[Tsoppi] I would like to recall that the statement by the general secretary says clearly and precisely that if the United States ends all nuclear explosions on a reciprocal basis, then the proper monitoring of observance of the moratorium will be provided in full by national technical means and also with the help of international procedures, with on-site inspection in cases where necessary. We invite the United States to come to an agreement on this. In other words, the last trump card in the hands of those who are insisting that nuclear weapons tests continue has been knocked out.

[Charikov] That is, the pretext that there is no verification.

[Tsoppi] Yes, that the Soviet Union does not agree to reciprocal monitoring. But by all means we do agree. You're welcome to it. And throughout the world people cannot understand why, when we are ending tests and when we are agreeing to monitoring, the United States is unable to agree to either of these things. Although as the British GUARDIAN wrote a few days ago, the United States could join in the nuclear weapons test moratorium without suffering any loss.

[Charikov] The idea of renouncing underground nuclear weapons as a means through which the arms race is fed has also been received with great approval in a whole range of other countries. At the end of last year the leaders of six countries; Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden, that is to say, countries representing different continents and countries at different stages of economic development, appealed to the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States to completely end all types of nuclear tests. At almost the same time the 40th anniversary session of the UN General Assembly adopted a corresponding resolution which received the votes of an overwhelming majority of world community member-states. Both these calls, each of the highest authority, were made at a time when the Soviet moratorium was already in operation, the moratorium that it had unilaterally declared. So, the resolute demand to put an end to the testing of new types of nuclear weapons, to block the channels of its further improvement, and to put an end to the nuclear era that began during the first half of the 20th century and which must come to a halt before the end of the century, this demand was accordingly addressed to Washington in the first place. PRAVDA yesterday published a report that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev once again confirmed the resolve of the Soviet Union to continue to seek the complete and universal banning of nuclear test explosions. It is essential that every opportunity be used to achieve the establishment of a bilateral Soviet-U.S. moratorium on this.

Press Freedom, Disinformation

[Tsoppi] I would like to say that a very definite line is being taken, both in the mass media and in right-wing political circles in the United States. This line is becoming more and more cynical as far as the stance on our peace-loving proposals and our persistence in the matter of ensuring peace is concerned. Literally a few days ago an article in THE WASHINGTON POST contained the following setnence: One must not pretend that the world can some day be completely rid of the threat of nuclear armaments. Pretend. The same observer goes on about why one must not pretend: Because the hope is created that in fact there is some alternative to nuclear war, whereas the

inevitable truth is such that there is no alternative. That is the fatally resigned and gloomy attitude they have toward the most important problem of the present-day world.

[Grigoryev] It has to be said that the American press -- a section of the American press, let us say, which is particularly close to the White House -- is attempting not only to put up against our proposals something that is incapable of being put up against them, but is somehow, of course it is impossible to silence them, but is at least attempting to pretend that the proposals have allegedly been discussed and are no longer the object of the world public's attention. THE WASHINGTON POST, which you mentioned, once suddenly wrote that the Soviet proposals had an enormous impact in the United States and throughout the world, and wrote the following: Yesterday 42 Republican senators had lunch with President Reagan. They had a lively discussion about taxes, the budget, etc, and not one of the senators raised the issue of the Soviet proposals. There is a deafening silence in Europe, no one has found time to comment on this. So that, with absolute insolence and cynicism, as you correctly state, white is being presented as black and vice versa in an attempt to pretend that nothing has happened. However, this will hardly succeed in any case. Hardly! I mentioned TIME, which you quoted from at the beginning. It writes quite the opposite to what its colleagues at THE WASHINGTON POST are writing: It writes that the Soviet proposals are put together in such a way as to immediately appeal to many inhabitants of Western European countries who are alarmed by nuclear missiles. Because of the Russians' initiative it will now be even more difficult for Reagan to justify continuing his "star wars" program. Reagan has ended up in a difficult position from the public relations point of view. It will be difficult for him to explain convincingly why he is prepared to reject a plan for saving the world from nuclear missiles. The Russians will probably also draw Reagan's attention to a somewhat illogical statement which he made at one point in his interview with four Soviet journalists, when he promised to strive to eliminate nuclear weapons before deploying his space systems.

[Tsoppi] Before deploying.

[Grigoryev] Yes, he promised. Now it has been proposed to eliminate them before deployment, but as yet, apart from more or less favorable statements, the United States has taken no tangible steps.

[Charikov] You know, Viktor Aleksandrovich, when you were quoting pronouncements of that WASHINGTON POST observer who sees no other alternative than the arms race, an arms build-up, ensuring military superiority over the Soviet Union, I was reminded of the atmosphere which prevailed at least at the beginning of the news conference in Moscow at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center in connection with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. I was present at that news conference and looked at the faces of individual American correspondents and began to feel sad. I observed that they had come to that news conference with their minds already made up. They had not yet looked at the diagram explaining and setting out everything in detail. They were already carrying the outline of their future reports in their heads and therefore it is not surprising that THE WASHINGTON POST immediately responded the way it did without troubling itself with any kind of analysis or attempt at finding common sense, at picking out common sense, yet journalists and the press bear the most mighty responsibility.

If we take what we call the average American, for example, the average German, Frenchman, or any other citizen of a capitalist country, he is, quite frankly, confused by figures, facts, and, so to speak, arguments; he is bombarded with demagogy from radio receivers, television screens, and newspaper columns. Do you understand?

[Tsoppi] I remember how at the Geneva news conference Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that during his conversation with Reagan he had told him he was forming the

impression that the American picture of the Soviet Union and its policies was built upon delusions.

[Charikov] Absolutely!

[Tsoppi] And these delusions are on a mass conveyor belt. These delusions are being fabricated every day, every hour, and every minute.

[Charikov] This is the result of a considerable number of Western journalists' unscrupulous approach to their very responsible work.

[Grigoryev] But it is not just a matter of an unscrupulous approach. Here, it is not so much a personal...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] People working for a given newspaper, in general, although the paper might call itself free, independent, anything it likes, free and open to all views, nonetheless will write what the owner says.

[Charikov] Absolutely! Behind that same correspondent, I will not mention names so as not to offend any important newspapers, stands his boss in Paris, Bonn, Washington. He manipulates the assessments; he, so to speak, sets the main line; and he is responsible in the final analysis for what millions of people will read in the newspaper the next day.

[Tsoppi] You have just said boss. A political storm has just arisen around one such boss in France. It concerns the man whom they now call the emperor of the French press, a man with very serious political ambitions, and who today heads a real newspaper empire. This is the same empire, that is, the same mass information media which guarantees the French the right to disinformation, the right to political ignorance and political, I would even say, obscurantism; and where, using talented journalists and employees, deliberately with unseemly objectives they create stereotypes instilled in the consciousness of millions of people, which create a distorted image of our country and immediately make all our positive steps on the international scene look suspicious.

[Charikov] Not only suspicious but sometimes simply unacceptable.

[Tsoppi] Yes. Everything emanating from Moscow is all deceit, is all a trap, is all a snare, and so on. This man is Robert Hersant. During the war in German-occupied Paris, a newspaper was published under the title JEUNE FORCE, the editor and publisher of that newspaper was Robert Hersant. He was quite young at that time and found his calling in Nuernberg where he covered the Nazi party congress.

The Paris branch of Goebbel's department then issued permission for this newspaper to be published and he published it. It was the newspaper of what was called the Young Front, which helped the occupiers fish out patriots and participants in the resistance. Robert Hersant was imprisoned for a short time after the war like many traitors who had served the Nazis. When freed from prison, he again felt an irresistable calling for the newspaper business. As early as 1950 he became the publisher of a motorists' newspaper, which mainly printed advertisements for automobile construction firms. He then purchased a fairly important provincial newspaper and the summit of his career came in 1975 when he bought one of France's most important and oldest newspaper, the bourgeois LE FIGARO from the decrepit, 90-year-old textile magnate Jean Provost. The newspaper continued to be published, only now under the leadership of a new boss holding an extreme right-wing stance on issues of the country's domestic and foreign policy. He then bought two other very important French newspapers, FRANCE-SOIR and AURORE, the AURORE in which the works of Zola and other great Frenchmen were published in their day.

Well, it is obviously not worthwhile spending too long on this busy, zig-zag career, but why has the name Hersant now once more appeared on the front page of newspapers and why is he a constant topic of conversation in France! Because, at the very beginning of this year, in the very first days of January, Robert Hersant's son, Philippe, bought the Rheims newspaper UNION and Hersant senior bought an entire newspaper publishing house a couple of days later, a newspaper trust called Progress which produces five newspapers in various large French cities. Five newspapers at once! By doing so, Hersant violated a law adopted under the Socialists not so very long ago in 1984, on their initiative, which restricts the possibility of concentrating too many press organs in one set of hands.

At that time one of LE FIGARO's leading observers was Raymond Aron. In one of the first editions of the newspaper under Hersant, Aron wrote an article entitled "The Difficulties of Freedom," which literally included the following phrase: In all countries where the press, radio and television are free in regard to the state, the question is who owns the capital of these enterprises and what influence the owner exerts on those who broadcast or write. These words turned out to be truly prophetic and today, when almost half of the French press and other mass information media are in one set of hands, and we have seen in just what hands, the hands of a man who began by aiding and abetting the Nazis in Paris, this forces us to think very hard indeed. Although, of course, Hersant is not a unique example in the West.

[Charikov] It is a familiar picture if we look, for example, at the United States. There, as you know, the international newspaper magnate Rupert Murdoch's star has risen, as they say.

[Tsoppi] Although he himself is Australian, as far as I remember.

[Charikov] Yes, he was Australian up until the end of last year, and in contrast to Hersant, he didn't break the law in acquiring several television stations, for which he needed American citizenship. He became a U.S. citizen -- and that's all there was to it.

[Tsoppi] Hersant, unlike Murdoch, and even the late Springer of the FRG, has political ambitions as well. He not only intends to be elected to parliament; his friends from right-wing bourgeois parties are already promising him that they will make him minister of -- what do you think -- information.

[Charikov] There you are!

[Grigoryev] Since the late Springer has been mentioned, it's worth saying that in spite of the fact that the king has died, his empire remains. This was a man who literally physically demonstrates the dependence of the so-called free press on the purse.

[Tsoppi] That's what Raymond Aron was writing about.

[Grigoryev] Yes, literally. He was a man who carried out what I would call a kind of spiritual censorship on the minds of West German citizens. He forced his postulates into their minds and so his policy demonstrated clearly, strongly, bluntly and visibly, if I may be allowed to recall those words, that any talk saying, that in the newspapers of the FRG, and we can add France, Italy, the United States -- any talk saying, that one can write or publish anything one likes in these papers, in fact it turns out that this anything is what the strong, powerful, wealthy, and so forth like.

Situation in Afghanistan

[Tsoppi] Sometimes things misfire. Recently in Kabul the Afghan Government invited a group of Western journalists that had previously constantly tried to penetrate from the rear through Pakistan to see what was going on there.

[Grigoryev] Well, since we're talking about Afghanistan, it seems to me that the undeclared war that the imperialist countries are waging through the dushmans against Democratic Afghanistan is war in the real sense, with weapons, shooting, blood, and explosions. It has also, however, taken the form of an information war. The bourgeois mass media tried to fence in Afghanistan, to erect around it some kind of solid wall of lies, disinformation, and calumny so that not one single word of the truth of what is going on in Afghanistan should reach the Western reader, and you are right, that is to say, the so-called journalists disguised in dushman robes have penetrated into the territory of Afghanistan. Some particularly resourceful ones even took part in reprisals against the peaceful population, activists of the people's revolutionary party, teachers...

[Charikov, interrupting] The television commentator of the U.S. CBS television company, Dan Rather, it was he who staged...

[Tsoppi] He was one of the first.

[Charikov] He staged an execution, simply sacrificing someone; what's more, one of the dushmans themselves.

[Grigoryev] But I would like to say that just recently, in spite of the fact that this undeclared war against Democratic Afghanistan is not weakening and it's known that hundreds of millions of dollars as before are being allocated to...

[Charikov, interrupting] One and a half billion dollars...

[Grigoryev] Over the whole period...

[Charikov] ...over the whole period has been spent by the United States.

[Grigoryev] Yes, since the April Revolution. And in this current financial year $270 million dollars, if I'm not mistaken, have been allotted. In spite of all this, Afghanistan is fighting, Afghanistan is building, Afghanistan is building a new life. It's interesting that recently, you said quite rightly, even Western journalists who get there are beginning -- and maybe they won't even write about this in their newspapers -- but in any case the word of truth is all the same beginning to get through even to the Western press. Well, we can no longer simply remain silent about the fact that, for example, the freedom-loving Pashtun tribes, which have risen up against the dushman rabble that cross their territory, are now defending both their freedom and in fact are defending their Afghan brothers, the revolutionary people of Afghanistan from this undeclared war. A press conference, several recent press conferences took place in Kabul and at one, by the way, those same representatives of the Western press learned not only that the economy of Afghanistan is developing successfully, but that social reforms are taking place in the country and the social base of the Afghan revolution is broadening...

[Tsoppi] And strengthening.

[Grigoryev] Yes, and strengthening, and this is obvious even in the strengthening of the bodies of the people's power, in broadening of, as we say, their political base.

Shevardnadze Tour

[Charikov] The undeclared war which the imperial powers, led by the United States, are carrying out against Afghanistan is unfortunately far from being the only focus of tension in Asia and the Pacific Ocean region. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries, especially those of the Asian Continent, are making persistent and consistent efforts to rid these focal points of tension, establish lasting peace and security and create an atmosphere of friendship and cooperation between the states of the Asian-Pacific region. Bearing witness to this is the just-ended visit of Comrade Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs, to Japan, the DPRK, and the Mongolian People's Republic. In the course of his stay in Pyongyang, during Soviet-Korean talks -- and this was subsequently reflected in the communique -- the urgent need to attain the normalization of the situation both in the region as a whole and especially in the Korean peninsula, was stressed once again.

As we know, the DPRK Government has decided not to hold major military maneuvers in February of this year and has also decided to halt all exercises for the period of talks between North and South on ways of uniting the country on a peaceful and democratic basis with the conditions, of course, that U.S. troops are withdrawn from South Korea. In the language of political reality, this step, the decision not to hold military maneuvers, signifies a substantial contribution to the creation of a favorable atmosphere for the talks themselves and for the resolution of the main issue.

How did the United States respond to this action? They replied in exactly the same way as they did when the Soviet Union announced its unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts: with measures of the opposite nature. They announced that large-scale war games were to be held on the Korean peninsula, involving the Armed Forces of South Korea, exactly at the beginning of February. One can say that this was simply a challenge to public opinion everywhere.

The United States has also failed to respond with any seriousness to a proposal advanced by the Mongolian People's Republic on concluding a convention on non-aggression and mutual nonuse of force. This proposal was addressed to the countries of Asia and the Pacific. The conclusion of a convention of this sort, as Comrade Shevardnadze declared at a dinner in Ulaanbaatar, would substantially improve the situation not just in the region itself but also in the world as a whole. The thirst of the peoples of the region, where about two-thirds of the world's population lives, for peace and goodneighborliness and the political will and common sense of government leaders will help to find solutions to existing conflict situations and will initiate an active Asian process for security and cooperation. On that, esteemed comrades, let me conclude today's program and on behalf of the participants, thank you for your attention. Goodbye, all the best to you.

SHEVARDNADZE SUBMITS LETTER TO UN ON ECONOMIC TIES

LD271849 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 27 Jan 86

["For Improvement of International Economic Relations and for Equal Cooperation" -- TASS headline]

[Text] New York, January 27 TASS -- A memorandum of the Soviet Government on "International Economic Security of States: An Important Condition for the Improvement of International Economic Relations," has been submitted to United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar in a letter from Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR. The text of the memorandum below (unofficial translation) is released as an official document of the United Nations.

International Economic Security of States: An Important Condition for the Improvement of International Economic Relations

(Memorandum of the USSR Government)

The tasks of normalizing international economic relations, of establishing equal trade, economic, scientific and technological contacts among countries that would have no room for any discrimination, and of ensuring the economic security of states are becoming more and more important and urgent in the present-day international situation.

The approval by the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly of the Soviet-sponsored resolution on international economic security became a manifestation of the recognition by the world community of the importance and urgency of these tasks, and of the striving of the overwhelming majority of the U.N. member states for the improvement and democratization of international economic relations. This U.N. resolution has formalized one of the cornerstone principles of international intercourse and is opening up a new important area for the activities of that organization in the economic field.

In this connection the Soviet Government, guided by its consistent course at the implementation of the aims of the United Nations Charter, at enhancing the role of the United Nations Organisation in the consolidation of peace, ensurance of international security, development of the economic cooperation among states, deems it necessary to draw attention to the following:

1. As a result of the course conducted by leading capitalist states in the international economic relations, the recent years have seen a sharp worsening of the international economic climate, the further increase of the crisis phenomena in world economic ties, the destabiiisation of commercial, economic, financial, scientific and technical relations among states, the worsening of the economic position of developing countries. The process of the improvement of the international economic relations, their restructuring on an equitable, democratic basis is blocked, the economic security of states is threatened.

The line at the aggravation of tension, at the solution of international problems by military power is the main obstacle to the normal development of the world economy and international economic cooperation. Vast resources are squandered on the spiralling of the arms race, above all that of nuclear arms, the dangerous plans of the militarisation of outer space at the expense of the requirements of social and economic development.

The use of mankind's achievements in science and technology for military purposes comlicates the socio-economic development of states, results in the deformation of international scientific and technological contacts and has an adverse effect on the entire complex of international relations, including those in the economic field.

A line of subverting equal and mutually beneficial economic cooperation, of exploiting international economic contacts to exert pressure on and to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states, of holding back the independent economic and social development of emergent countries and of encouraging their exploitation by transnational monopolies and banks is being pursued. Such methods as unilateral scrapping of existing economic treaties and agreements, instigation of trade, crediting and technological blockades and discriminatory measures in trade, science and technology -- methods which are at odds with U.N. principles -- are being openly asserted in economic relations among states.

Such actions create an atmosphere of tension and mistrust in international economic relations, disorganise world economy and trade, undermine its legal basis, are an obstacle to the establishment of a new international economic order on an equitable and democratic basis.

2. The problem of external indebtedness of developing countries to the West has assumed unprecedented acuteness in the recent years. The payment of the interest on the debts leads to a speedier pumping of financial resources from developing countries, is rendering lifeless the economy of newly-independent states. These resources are enriching monopolies, are spent on financing budgetary deficits and military programmes of Western countries.

The problem of external indebtedness is part of relations of developing countries with the West and its genuine solution is impossible without the restructuring of international economic relations on an equitable, equal and democratic basis. The necessary condition for the solving of the problem of foreign debt is the lowering of interest rates on loans and credits, stabilisation of currency rates, refusal from protectionism in trade, restructuring of international financial system with taking into account the interest of all states and democratisation of financial institutions functioning within its framework. An end must be put to using financial difficulties of separate countries for bringing political pressure to bear on them and for interference in internal affairs of sovereign states.

3. The stabilization of the overall economic and monetary-financial situation and the implementation of the U.N. resolutions on restructuring international economic relations on a fair and democratic basis, first and foremost the Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States and the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, constitute the most important prerequisite for the improvement of international economic relations and for ensuring international economic security. However, these program resolutions have not yet been implemented in practice because of a destructive course pursued by well-known circles in international affairs. Attempts are being made to call in question their practical importance and to commit them to oblivion.

Such initiatives of developing and non-aligned states as proposals on holding U.N.-sponsored "global talks" on the more acute world economic problems and on the convocation of an international monetary-financial conference, and talks to work out a code of conduct for transnational corporations and to regulate technology transfers are directed at providing conditions for ensuring the international economic security of states. However, these initiatives have also been stalemated.

The blocking of the solution of the problems of improving and developing international cooperation is being camouflaged by allegations about "a crisis of multilateralism," and by claims that the United Nations and its agencies are incapable of conducting effective multilateral talks and achieving concrete results on a broad spectrum of social and economic problems and that there is no political homogeneity of states.

All this cannot be assessed otherwise than as a manoeuvre employed for avoiding the solution of ripe problems, for keeping the United Nations Organisation apart from resolving principled economic and social tasks of the present.

4. The Soviet Government, viewing the United Nations Organisation as an effective instrument for solving vital problems of humanity, including economic problems, expresses profound concern over the lack of real progress in the United Nations activity for the improvement and restructuring of international economic relations. The Soviet Union urges all countries to demonstrate political will in creating the necessary conditions for ensuring international economic security.

The very notion of international economic security which is part of international security as a whole, presupposes, above all, the renunciation of the use of or threat with power methods, protection of lawful rights and interests of states, creation of reliable guarantees that they will not be violated.

Economic security of states is linked directly with the ensurance of peace, the ending of the arms race on earth and prevention of its transfer to space, a resolute improvement of the entire international situation, a return to the policy of detente.

The Soviet Union offered the world in a statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on January 15, 1986, a concrete program for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, for ridding mankind of the threat of self-annihilation, and for ensuring dependable security for the present and succeeding generations. The implementation of the complex of new initiatives embracing all the important aspects and areas of activity in the interests of disarmament, the restoration of trust and the promotion of prospects for a peaceful future and for the progress of all the peoples, formulated in the statement, not only offers mankind more security but also makes it possible to allocate more resources for improving the living standards of the population.

The principle of armaments before development, imposed by militarism, should be supplanted by a reverse formula, disarmament for development.

The ending of the arms race, the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons and drastic reductions in the military spending of states constitute the most realistic and effective source of funds which are so needed to meet the economic and social needs of the developing countries and to resolve such global problems of mankind as the overcoming of economic backwardness, the eradication of hunger, poverty, epidemic disease and illiteracy in vast areas, the meeing of the growing needs of mankind in energy, raw materials and food resources, environmental protection and the peaceful exploration of the world ocean and outer space.

Respect for national independence and sovereignty, non-intervention in internal affairs, equality, renunciation of discrimination and the unfailing observance of the inalienable sovereign rights of states to choose their economic systems independently are fundamentally important to ensuring international economic security. State-to-state intercourse must be free from arbitrariness, unlawful embargoes, boycotts, trade, crediting and technological blockades, and the exploitation of economic contacts for political pressure.

The need to ensure international economic security was stressed in a program of action for improving international economic relations that was put forward by the summit economic conference of the CMEA member countries in Moscow in June 1984.

The implementation of that program objectively meets the aspirations and interests of all countries and contributes to the achievement of genuine economic independence by the developing states.

The Soviet Union considers it necessary to initiate practical steps to rid international economic contacts of discriminatory restrictions of every sort and of all other artificial obstacles creating a threat to the economic security of states.

This must be promoted by the implementation in practice of the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly condemning economic coercion as a means of political pressure on developing countries, on measures of confidence-building in international economic relations, on the United Nations role in promoting international economic, scientific and technical cooperation. The interests of economic security of states require effective control over the activity of transnational corporations that continue neo-colonialist exploitation of newly-independent states, that are disorganising world trade and scientific and technical cooperation among states. The main thing in these matters is that all states should adhere to the principles of cooperation approved by the majority of the United Nations members.

The Soviet Government condemns resolutely any forms of discrimination and diktat in international economic relations undermining economic security of the states.

The time has come when the United Nations Organisation should raise its voice against these negative phenomena and work out concrete measures to eradicate them.

The USSR urges all countries to take steps to ensure international economic security which is an important condition for the improvement and development of international economic relations to the benefit of the social and economic progress of all countries and peoples and is prepared to cooperate constructively with all states concerned, both in the United Nations Organisation and outside it, in the implementation of this pressing task of the present.

UN ENVOY CITED ON DEBATE ON ISRAELI 'AGGRESSION'

LD280948 Moscow TASS in English 0904 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Text] New York January 28 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

Speakers in the Security Council's continued discussion here on the situation in the Israeli-occupied territories demand resolute steps to put an end to Israel's outrages in the occupied Arab lands and its aggression against neighbouring states. Representatives of the international community point out with indignation that it is through the fault of Israel and its oversea partner that the council has to discuss at the beginning of the U.N.-proclaimed International Year of Peace, the escalation of Israel's aggression which jeopardises world peace and security.

The U.N. ambassadors of Algeria, Ghana, Tunisia, India, Iran, and other countries and Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, secretary general of the Islamic Conference, pointed out during the discussion that Tel Aviv's latest actions violating Moslem holy places must not be regarded separately and apart from Israel's general policy in the occupied Arab lands, a policy aimed at annexation, at denying the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, a policy of continued armed aggression against Arab states. What the Israeli occupation forces are doing in the occupied lands, said Mohammed Ould Boye, permanent representative of Mauritania at the U.N., does not differ from the atrocities of the Hitler Nazis and the South African racists.

Vitaliy Safronchuk, first deputy Soviet ambassador to the UNO, said that the problem created by the Israeli occupation of Arab lands in 1967 is waiting for a full settlement. It is necessary to ensure total withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied territories and give the Palestinian people an opportunity to exercise fully their inalienable rights, including the right to establish their own state. In other words, what is needed is a comprehensive and just political settlement of the Middle East problem. The way to such a settlement lies through an international conference. Without this there can be no, and will be no, lasting peace in the Middle East, he said.

U.S. MEDIA SAID TO 'SLANDER' UNESCO GENERAL CONFERENCE

LD262119 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 26 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 26 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The "war" unleashed by the Western mass media against the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), is waged, above all, by methods of brazen distortion of facts, misinformation and outright slander. This is shown convincingly by the analysis of the "coverage" of UNESCO's latest general conference by the U.S. press, made by UNESCO Office for Liaison With United Nations.

Though the conference lasted over four weeks and dwelt on the entire range of UNESCO's programmes in the sphere of education, science, culture, the media and communications, reports about it were published by only a handful of U.S. newspapers. One would look in vain in these reports for if only a word about UNESCO's activity in the sphere of education, science and culture that is widely supported by the majority of states. Instead of that, reports of the U.S. "free press" boiled down to slandering the authoritative international organisation, whose activity does not suit Washington. While information was lacking, there was a spate of vicious commentaries. The office noted that 103 newspapers ran such commentaries, in which the editorial opinion was not confirmed by a single fact.

As Alain Raffrey, acting director of UNESCO Liaison Office at the United Nations, noted, extremely negative and hostile approach constantly manifested by the majority of the U.S. media, was characteristic of the "coverage" of UNESCO's activity by the U.S. press.

WILLIAM COLBY CITED ON RESPONSE TO ARMS PROPOSAL

OW240735 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Commentary by Aleksandr Serikov; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The new Soviet peace initiatives continue to evoke a lively response in the world. Here is our commentary:

[Serikov] Hello, comrades I would like to dwell on three points which characterize opinion in the world to the proposals of the Soviet Union. First, it is the respect which the Soviet initiative elicited. There is practically not a single well-known or influential person or organization that would openly, as was the case in the past, reject out of hand the new steps on the road to normalization of the world situation taken by the Soviet State. For example, William Colby, former director of the CIA, who highly assessed the Soviet peace initiatives, called on the U.S. Administration to join the moratorium on nuclear tests and to repudiate the SDI project.

I think that a reaction of this type is conditional in the first place on the validity of the Soviet proposals. Thanks to the meeting in Geneva, the world community was able to widely familiarize itself with the constructive position of the Soviet Union on a series of international questiong and to react to it with understanding and sympathy. The reason for this understanind and sympathy can be found in the logical and well-reasoned Soviet positions.

One more point which is a positive result of our initiatives is the force that they give to the movements of fighters against nuclear weapons and for ending the arms race in various countries. For example, Pat Harman, one of the organizers of the U.S. Campaign for the Freeze of Nuclear Weapons organization, stated that the discontinuation of nuclear tests would be the first step in the reduction of nuclear weapons. We are struggling for the United States to join the moratorium, she said, and the movement of peace-loving forces in our country has been very much inspired by the new Soviet initiatives.

NATO WAR GAMES MARKED BY DEATHS, DAMAGE AND EARLY

LD242045 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1630 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Text] Paris, 24 Jan (TASS) -- The major NATO exercises "Certain Sentinel," taking place on FRG territory in the immediate vicinity of the borders of the GDR and Czechoslovakia, will end tomorrow, a week earlier than planned due to severe weather conditions, says Gen Andrew (Chambert), the commander of these exercises, AFP reports.

According to the Bavarian police, in the course of these war games, in which 73,000 servicemen of the United States, Canada and the FRG took part, the damage done to the environment in Bavaria is estimated at DM1 million ($400,000).

As a result of the movement of military vehicles, tanks and other war material on the roads, over 200 traffic accidents have been reported, including 33 accidents involving loss of life.

In the course of the exercises two American helicopters crashed. Four American servicemen died and three were injured.

KYODO CITED ON U.S.-PRC JOINT NAVAL EXERCISES

PM231051 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jan 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "U.S. and PRC Joint Naval Exercises"]

[Text] Tokyo, 20 Jan -- The KYODO news agency reports from Beijing, citing diplomatic circles, that the U.S. and PRC navies held joint exercises in the northern part of the South China Sea 12 January in which two ships from each side took part. Taking part on the U.S. side were ships belonging to the U.S. naval forces in the Pacific and on the Chinese side a destroyer and a support tanker [korabl-Zapravshchik].

REPORT, COMMENTARY ON U.S.-LIBYAN TENSIONS

'Show of Force' Continues

LD272251 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 27 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] U.S. 6th Fleet continues its show of force off the Libyan coastline, ABC, an American TV Company reported. Fourteen U.S. warships, including two aircraft carriers which had already entered the Gulf of Sidra yesterday, are taking part in the exercises. In response to this crude provocation, Libya is adopting countermeasures. The country's frontier troops and Navy have been put on enhanced alert.

A protest demonstration has taken place in Tripoli. Its participants have voiced their resolve to rebuff any encroachments by the U.S. imperialism on Libya's freedom and independence. Arab countries and nonaligned states express their solidarity with the Libyan people and condemn the brazen and shameless policy of state terrorism, pursued by the United States. [Video shows warships, Al-Qadhdhafi visiting warship; cuts to shots of demonstration.]

Kornilov Explains 'New Globalism'

LD271357 Moscow TASS in English 1344 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow January 27 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov

Disquieting, extremely disquieting events are taking place off the North African coasts. Breaching generally recognized norms of international law, the United States is being engaged in sabre-rattling near the Libyan borders. 14 combat ships of the U.S. 6th Fleet, including two aircraft-carriers, are being involved in the provocative "flexing of muscles", according to yesterday's report by the American ABC television network.

The tense situation in the Mediterranean, which may flare up into a military conflict at a minute's notice, is being accompanied by the mounting of Washington's propaganda broadsides at sovereign Libya.

The aggressive actions give rise to concern and mass protests by the world public. Strongly denouncing the United States' anti-Libyan actions, many political figures and press bodies stress that these facts are not solitary, exceptional instances. They are yet another graphic illustration of the intention of the imperialist circles in the United States to continue banking on force with regard to sovereign nations and put into life the Washington-devised hegemonistic doctrine of "new globalism".

It is known that in a bid to put a kind of "theoretical basis" under its schemes of interference, pressure and blackmail with regard to countries, above all developing nations, whose independent foreign policies "do not suit" the United States, Washington has worked out a whole series of militarist and hegemonistic postulates designed to justify the use of military force and even direct intervention by the United States in any part of the world, even thousands of miles away from the U.S. coasts.

These postulates were set out, specifically, in the recent statement by the Pentagon chief, Caspar Weinberger, at a Washington conference on "low intensity warfare".

The same "philosophy of plunder" was openly proclaimed by Patrick Buchanan, one of the leading presidential advisers. America, he declared, preserves the right to extend support to the movements fighting for national liberation.

What they in Washington mean by the "movements" publicized by Mr Buchanan is no secret. These are gangs of Somocistas engaged in hit-and-run attacks against Nicaragua, CIA-financed Afghan bandits whose hands are stained with the blood of thousands of civilians. These are terrorists of the Angolan splinter grouping UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] and Pol Pot men who are seeking to hinder the construction of a new life in Kampuchea, and similar rabble operating under the patronage of American special services.

Of course, the architects of "new globalism", the doctrine of direct armed interference by the United States, in an attempt to camouflage their hegemonistic designs, resort to propaganda gimmicks of all sorts to distort the situation by prattling about the "legitimacy" of the fight against "international terrorism", about the "need to ensure U.S. national security."

These are all false and rather awkward tricks. Washington's undeclared war on sovereign Afghanistan, the U.S. attempts to reverse developments in revolutionary Nicaragua by way of force, sabotage and provocations, and the current show of force aimed against Libya are parts of America's "globalism" in action.

From the assassination of leaders of states which opted for a path of independent development to "undeclared wars" with a view to destabilizing and ousting revolutionary regimes -- such is the evolution of imperialist adventurism.

The point at issue is that certain quarters in the United States, which regard nearly the entire globe as a sphere of "American vital interests", hope, contrary to the world realities, that they will succeed in forcing independent states and peoples to abandon their sovereign rights.

The point at issue, in fact, is the aggressive aspiration of the world's biggest imperialist power, the policy of state-sponsored terrorism, the policy which contradicts both the U.N. Charter and the final act of the conference on security and cooperation in Helsinki that were signed by the United States.

It is not the "fight against terrorism" that worries the U.S. circles which have devised and are implementing the imperialist doctrine of "new globalism". This hegemonistic doctrine is a tool of crude, including armed, interference by the United States in the regions and parts of the world where the United States would like to establish its domination.

SPACE SHUTTLE CHALLENGER LAUNCH DELAYED

LD281016 Moscow TASS in English 0825 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 27 TASS -- The launching of the reusable space (ship) Challenger has been delayed for the fourth time after a computer detected a flaw in the ship's pressurization system an hour before the blast-off. Earlier the launching had been put off because of adverse weather conditions at Cape Canaveral in Florida. According to officials, the date for the next attempted launching of Challenger will be announced within 24 hours.

REAGAN REMARKS SHOW ARMS SPENDING TO CONTINUE

LD272343 Moscow TASS in English 2335 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 27 TASS -- The Washington administration has no intention of reducing spending on the arms race as it trims a number of federal programs in the next fiscal year. This follows clearly from statements made by President Reagan today. He admitted that the astronomic budget deficit is a serious obstacle to productive economic growth but at the same time categorically rejected the view of many authorities that the USA is spending inordinately much on military needs. The White House chief tried to justify the "need" further to increase military spending, the growth of which, according to the press, is planned at the level of three per cent after inflation in fiscal 1987, by the alleged gap between the USA and the Soviet Union in that field.

WEINBERGER REAFFIRMS ARMS BUILDUP POLICY

LD280846 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 28 TASS -- Caspar Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defence, has reaffirmed the intention of the Washington Administration, to carry on the dangerous policy of speedy arms build up. Addressing a conference of the Reserve Officers Association, he said that it would be a mistake to believe that the modernisation of the U.S. defence had been completed. Caspar Weinberger admitted that during the stay of the Reagan administration in power in the USA the strength of the reserve components of the U.S. Armed Forces had reached the record figure of more than one million, and their budget had doubled over that time.

COMMENTARY ON SAVIMBI'S UPCOMING VISIT TO U.S.

May Be Funded 'Covertly'

LD280037 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Viktor Ivanov commentary]

[Text] Savimbi's principle aim is to get American military aid to wage war on the Angolan Government. The news media reports with reference to congressional sources that the Washington administration would like for a start to give Savimbi $15 million. The UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] leader will meet with Secretary of State Shultz and will probably be received by President Reagan. There is ample evidence, however, the administration prefers to give aid along secret channels; secret because too close ties with the group that openly terrorizes its own nation can prove compromising.

Savimbi and his supporters have a dirty and shameful record. They have wiped out communities, ruined economic facilities, downed passenger airliners, and killed civilians. Equally notorious are their close ties with the regime in South Africa, which has been lavishly supplying UNITA with money and munitions, and giving it shelter in occupied Namibia. This makes it clear why the high-ranking administration representatives, who only a short time ago were openly debating forms of aiding Savimbi's groups, have switched over to an exclusively moral backing talk. But the about-face is additional proof that the administration in Washington will now opt for funding the Angolan separatists covertly.

While Savimbi's aim is obvious -- to escape a total defeat -- what does the United States Administration hope to achieve by fuelling tension in another region of Africa? Although views on this score have differed, anyone can see the United States cannot possibly hope that the Angolan terrorists can win a military victory. This being so, United States policy is geared to fanning the conflict-prone situation in the region and making it a permanent flashpoint. If the United States succeeds, it hopes to be able to play its trump cards; first of all to destabilize the economic and political situation in Angola, thus dealing a blow at the prospects for the liberation movement in Southern Africa; second, to create a pretext for preserving Namibia as South Africa's springboard of pressure on nearby liberated nations; and third, to justify the repression committed by the apartheid regime, presenting it as a natural reaction to non-existent outside subversive activities.

United States policy towards Angola is even more far-fetched. Maintaining and fanning regional conflicts is part of the so-called new globalism, a doctrine that serves to justify United States armed and subversive interference in any corner of the world. Besides, hotbeds of conflict of this kind serve to help Washington to justify its countermeasures to disarmament, and [to] a stop to the arms race.

'Lavish' Reception Prepared

LD280723 Moscow TASS in English 0717 GMT 28 Jan 86

["Brazen Interference in Angolan Affairs" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 28 TASS -- TASS commentator Yuriy Ulyanovskiy writes:

A lavish reception is being prepared in Washington for Jonas Savimbi, head of the UNITA anti-Angolan terrorist grouping, who is going to the United States on a "private visit". It is reported that Savimbi will be received by President Reagan and Secretary of State Shultz.

The contentions by American propaganda about the administration's concern about "democracy in Angola" will hardly convince the African and international public of Washington's good intentions. The expansion of military, financial and political assistance to UNITA pursues quite a definite other aim -- to step up the struggle against Angola's lawful government.

When the idea of the so-called "linkage" between Namibia's decolonisation and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola failed to find support even among America's allies, Washington decided to resort to pressure on sovereign Angola. Neither has the United States Administration given up attempts to present its placeman as a sort of "political force". During Savimbi's visit the White House intends even to submit to congress a draft resolution expressing "moral support" for the bandit formations. Late in December UNITA already got 30 million dollars from the White House. All in all, the White House intends to spend up to 300 million dollars to finance terrorist operations in Angola.

At the time when Washington patronizes terrorists the participants in the 45th session of the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity in the Nigerian capital condemn the policy of terror and aggression against "Frontline" States. The demonstration of Washington's alliance with African "contras" is a hostile act not only against Angola but also against other countries of the continent.

Savimbi Expects 'Handouts'

LD272243 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 27 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] I cannot at all get used to the shameless flippancy with which U.S. diplomats treat international law. By way of an example, a routine press conference, chaired as usual by Bernard Kalb, assistant secretary of state for public affairs, was held in the State Department last week.

Among questions put to him were those about African problems. Replying to journalists on a question about Angola, Kalb said, and I quote: UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] is a legitimate national organization and the administration is trying to show that it supports it in an effective form. Well, what can one say on this score? It is universally known that UNITA is not a legitimate national organization, but an underground terrorist gang of murderers, pogromists and men of violence who have set themselves against the people and the government of their former country.

Consequently, rendering assistance to this rabble is tantamount to the crudest possible interference in the internal life of a sovereign state with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations. Is it not enough that the administration is constantly pushing through Congress bills to set aside quite sizeable sums for rendering military assistance to UNITA.

Jonas Savimbi, the ringleader of this gang, who is going to the United States for new handouts, is awaited with open arms in Washington tomorrow. The U.S. press reports that the program of the visit will, in all likelihood, include a meeting with Casey, the CIA boss and with President Reagan.

Well, other than spreading one's hands in a gesture of helplessness, there is nothing one can do.

IZVESTIYA'S FALIN STUDIES U.S. NAVAL STRATEGY

PM241135 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Part 1 of article by IZVESTIYA political observer Valentin Falin: "Back to the Stone Age"]

[Text] I propose to take the bull by the horns and not be distracted by the grandiloquent turns of phrase which Washington is so generous with. Because the words about the "blessings of peace" have yet to be followed by anything except more words. The advocates of an ultrahard line who tried last November to torpedo the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva are not about to retreat. On the contrary, they are going all out on the principle: The worse things are, the better they like it.

In the first days of the new year a report by Admiral J. Watkins, U.S. Navy chief of staff, entitled "Naval Strategy" was published. Before publication, the text of the report was submitted to Defense Secretary C. Weinberger for his approval. Officials characterized the admiral's ideas as "currently the clearest exposition of the approach" to waging war at sea. So "clear" that former Pentagon staffer (B. Pouzen) described the strategy as "excessively provocative," fraught with the "greatest likelihood" of unleashing nuclear war, and "diametrically opposed" to the official principle of preventing nuclear conflict.

It may appear that people in the adminstration are traveling in the same orbit, but in different directions. It would probably suit some people for the ignorant to think so. To think so, and to feel envious -- so that is how things are in free America! R. Reagan states that there will be no winners in a nuclear conflict, and that therefore such a conflict is unthinkable, and must not take place. Yet the Navy staff, which the sanction of the defense secretary, demonstrates that the weapons have by no means lost their significance, and puts forward its route to a victorious war in the nuclear age. Are those disagreements, or different interpretations? Or different aspects of the same thing? Let us try and see.

Adm Watkins visualizes our time as the "age of peace and violence." In his eyes, "preparation for global warfare" is a "very important element of deterrence." The U.S. Navy, the admiral predicts, will in the long term have to step up its activeness "in the hot spots of the globe," showing its presence in peaceful conditions and reacting to "crises." Watkins specified that it is a question of "conflicts and other crises" which do not necessarily affect the interests of the United States and its allies. Interference is justified if conflicts "create a background for potentially more serious conflicts between major powers."

According to the chief of staff's fiction, this "background" is most likely to arise from events in Asia, Africa, or Central and Latin America. The task accordingly set is for the United States to acquire the "capability to stabilize and control crises in Third World countries." "Although we are not now at war," Watkins went on, "the scale of our operations is approximately 20 percent higher than during the Vietnam war." (Not a bad illustration to highlight Reagan's favorite argument about U.S. "self-disarmament.") But what is 20 percent, to the Pentagon? A mere trifle, only a taste, "testifying," to quote the admiral's words in all their primordial absurdity, "to the increase in the need for forward-based forces in peacetime; this requirement, moreover, is made more urgent by the probability that in the event of war we will not have much time for mobilization. In the era of peace in conditions of violence, the Navy is at the front line, and will remain there for the foreseeable future."

The new naval strategy proposes the use "in response to a threat from Third World countries" of chemical, bacteriological, and nuclear weapons "in various combinations in practically all the oceans." The concept of a "threat" is interpreted vaguely and not pedantically, so as to make the nuclear big stick seem appropriate in "combination" with other systems of mass murder. Not for nothing does the admiral set his sights on local disputes and intrastate processes: Grenada is not mentioned, but its example runs through the whole tissue of the report as an example suitable for dissemination.

"Reacting to crises," Watkins declares, "has long been a function of the Navy and the Marines. Between 1946 and 1982, in approximately 250 instances of the use of American armed forces, the Navy was the main factor in our reaction in approximately 80 percent of crises." Do not think that the chief of staff has decided to add a touch of steel to the standard smiling face of the Yankee "democrat." The admiral is advertising his wares -- violence, without which, he is convinced, imperialist America cannot survive. Only "forward basing and high mobility," Watkins stresses, "offer the opportunity to use the Navy in the event of a crisis at any time in any part of the globe."

"Naval forces," the report says, "can remain autonomous for as long as necessary in remote regions"; the Navy has shown "in the conditions of real crises" that it is capable of influencing events through its "presence, observation, the threat of force, artillery or air strikes, landings by the marines, the evacuation of civilians, the imposition of a blockade or quarantine, and the prevention of interference by Soviet or other forces."

And the most important thing, in the chief of staff's view, is that "the Navy has unique potential to control escalation. The Navy can be visible or can conceal itself, can threaten or not threaten, and can easily be sent to the necessary regions and just as easily withdrawn." It is like reading moss-covered parchments from the distant past. If I like, I'll threaten you: If I get uptight, I'll shoot; If I get out of bed on the wrong side, I'll send a fleet to the Indian Ocean; If I quarrel with my mother-in-law, I'll send them to the Pacific. You can declare war, but it is simpler and less bother to attack "in conditions of peace." As they have hitherto done, as they have done "on approximately 250 occasions" since World War II. They themselves have lost count, they themselves do not remember exactly, and want flagrant tyranny, surpassing all examples of piracy in the past, to be some kind of privilege for Washington.

It is hardly possible to imagine antthing worse. Hear Watkins out, and judge for yourself. We were talking above about the "strategy of reacting to crises." But there is also "war-fighting strategy." "Reacting to crises" and interference in the affairs of "Third World countries" is almost a matter of routine. It sometimes costs more to get to the place than to shoot to your heart's content. What the authors of the report mean by war is, first and foremost, armed conflict with the Soviet Union. And the "war-fighting strategy" is formulated on the basis of this premise.

The "key" to success for the United States in a military confrontation with the USSR is declared to be to "provide (the Americans) with the potential for a prolonged global conflict." The Navy's contribution to the confrontation is defined as a strategy "consisting of three stages: deterrence, or the transition to war; seizing the initiative; taking hostilities into the enemy zone." The stages are not confined within "precise time frames," and, the report admits, are a reflection of what is desired, rather than an "attempt to predict what is essentially an unpredictable future."

Take note of that formula -- "deterrence, or the transition to war." How expedient Washington will find that. The idea of a preemptive strike is lightly camouflaged, or, if you like, brought up to date. But, like card players sitting round a table, the American strategists do not know how their venture will end. Formerly, in similar situations, the smart guys used to say: Wait and see. That was the first salvo. Today, it is urgently recommended to think before you shoot, because once you start, it may well turn out that there is no opportunity to think. Has this fact penetrated the naval staff? It does not look like it. The level of thought among people who have at their disposal means of destruction which exceed many times over all our planet's theoretical and practical reserves for survival is revealed by their discussions about the specific content of each of the "stages" of naval strategy indicated in the report. These are remarkably odious.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA ATTACKS BOSTON JOURNALIST

PM271541 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jan 86 p 4

[Igor Vitaliyev article: "The 'Evolution' of Gary Thatcher, or On Certain Traditions of Russian Hospitality"]

[Text] Let us begin with a statement. It expressed the hope that the incident which occurred in Leningrad would be a reminder to the U.S. newspaper correspondent in the future to display common sense and respect for the country which had granted him accreditation.

The correspondent's latest articles, alas, attest otherwise. He has not apparently learnt his lesson -- respect for our country is not part of his "program of residence."

Let us introduce the "hero" -- he is Gary Thatcher, correspondent of Boston's THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR. One of those gallant U.S. journalists who love to discourse on working conditions in Moscow...

On 7 August last year Thatcher was detained at customs in Leningrad during an attempt to bring anti-Soviet material into our country. He immediately kicked up a fuss: He was backed up by the Boston publishers, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the U.S. State Department. VOA was also quick to make its protest, immediately sympathizing with the "victim" and demanding that "Gary Thatcher's rights be respected, like those of other foreign correspondents working in the USSR."

The "voice" did not make a fuss without purpose: The Washington headquarters of the radio station on Independence Avenue saw the incident in Leningrad as a pretext to talk again about creative "freedom" for foreign correspondents.

It is this "freedom" we are talking about. The "freedom" to denigrate our country and misinform the Western public about the Soviet way of life.

Gary Thatcher has been working at THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR Moscow correspondents' center for a considerable time now. So what contribution has he made to his compatriots' understanding of our country and our way of life? In order to reply to this question we must first and foremost argue whether the U.S. correspondent was in fact striving to increase this understanding. This proviso is no accident.

Let us look at what and how Gary Thatcher writes, and how the reader of the Boston newspaper, which -- not without reason -- is considered to be one of the most widely read in America, sees our country after reading his articles from Moscow.

If we take Thatcher's articles in the last few months, reprinted in the paper's European "Digest," it is easy to see for yourself that, day by day moving increasingly away from the method of "balanced information" -- characteristic unfortunately of only a few of his colleagues -- with which Thatcher began his work in Moscow, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR correspondent slipped quite rapidly into overt malevolence and hostility toward the Soviet Union and Soviet people.

These were his articles for March 1985: Thatcher wrote about the changes in the Soviet leadership and the new tasks of socioeconomic development facing our society -- without any personal commentaries and appraisals. He mainly "rehashed" information from the Soviet newspapers, larding his articles -- appropriately and inappropriately -- with references to "Western analysts" and "Western diplomats" who apparently were supposed to lend his articles more "weight" and "objectivity." But some kind of "balanced approach" was still apparent there.

Which cannot be said of another of his articles entitled "Turning Soviet Rivers." There again there are many references such as "a Western specialist says...", "Another states...", "A Western diplomat believes.." -- but a completely different key is already struck in this selection of "anonymous remarks." "It is perfectly clear that the Russians have good cause to suspect that, unless Mother Nature made a flagrant mistake, it must be an accomplice in an anti-Soviet plot," says Gary Thatcher, flabbergasting the reader right at the start of the article, with his "inferences." And he finally "finishes off" the reader with other ideas: The project allegedly poses a "threat to the West."

"This is certainly a plan by the Russians to start a weather war against us," the reader is tormented with doubts. Thatcher does not disabuse him. On the contrary: "It is like the monster Frankenstein, it is very difficult to kill -- nothing will come of it!" Thatcher says citing "a Western diplomat."

What is "it"? And who appears in the role of "monster"? Apparently the USSR. There is simply nobody else. But why he included "mother-nature" among the "dissidents" and even "accomplices in a plot" is difficult to understand. Some other kind of logic is needed here, no doubt. Gary Thatcher's logic.

In June last year THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR correspondent decided to illuminate readers about the problem of restructuring the Soviet economy. His article mentions nothing about our successes, the standard of economic progress achieved, or the actual essence of this restructuring.

His theme is precisely the "problems." Indeed, we have our problems and difficulties and we talk about them openly. And are there really so few problems in America? But we -- unlike the United States -- are getting down to solving our problems and are doing this successfully. However, to believe Thatcher, our most serious problem consists in ridding ourselves...of chimneys. There is a photograph of old Moscow in the paper as illustration.

August 1985. Gary Thatcher decided to enter into open battle against Soviet ideology. But without the fetters of objectivity." And he embarked on the path trodden by many of his predecessors -- he made for the "freedom fighters," or to put it more simply, for the handful of renegades living on handouts from Western correspondents and ready to heap dirt on all the sundry in the hope of wide Western "publicity."

Thatcher wrote with great sorrow about those whom he bombastically called "dissidents." One western journalist, Thatcher said, visiting the USSR 10 years after his first visit, sought out his old acquaintances among the "rights defenders," but "they had all either emigrated, or were in prison or exile..."

And Thatcher accompanied all these tales with quotations from the Helsinki Final Act, though it makes no mention of the fact that the governments which signed it should pander to antistate activity in their own country.

The U.S. correspondent called for "humanity" and "respect for human rights," but it is interesting here that he referred to information from reports of the so-called Keston College, a British "research center to study religion and communism." One of these "reports," for instance, mentioned the "observance of civil rights in various countries" and related that a "secret monastery in the region of Sukhumi was subjected to helicopter attack, and that a flame-thrower was used to destroy the believers..."

How they must have been visibly moved, the readers of THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, established in 1908 by Mary Eddy the founder of the "Church of Christ," a publication which even today propagates religious values. But they would no doubt have been interested to learn where the fabrications about the "persecution of believers in the USSR" came from: Keston College is a "branch" of the CIA in Europe. However, Thatcher naturally did not report this. Instead he noted in detail the types of "martyrs" enumerating all their "merits" except for one thing: Those he called "prisoners of conscience" and "supporters of the fulfillment of the Helsinki agreement" have violated Soviet laws and have been judged for that and not for "free-thinking." They are anti-Soviets, traitors to the motherland, and simply criminals -- Thatcher included them all in a common list of "human rights fighters."

It is difficult to say now what and how Gary Thatcher was taught before coming to Moscow, although the "special purpose" of his work was obviously determined in advance. But it would not be inappropriate for him to look at the code of U.S. laws.

There, in a language with which Thatcher must be very familiar, it is unequivocally written in paragraph No. 2385: "Assistance with a view to overthrowing the government. A person, who, with a view to overthrowing or destroying the government of the United States or any of its states, prints, publishes, edits, issues, sells, distributes, or publicly disseminates printed or written materials which contain advice or suggest the duty, need, desire, and correctness of overthrowing or destroying such governments, or a person who organizes or helps to organize a society, group, or community of people engaged in studying, assisting, or encouraging actions to forcibly overthrow or destroy any of the aforementioned governments, or a person who becomes a member (is a member) of such a society, group, or so forth, in the knowledge of the aims for which these associations were created, is liable to a fine not exceeding $20,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 20 years, or both."

In addition, Mr Thatcher, as well as the aforementioned measures, U.S. law stipulates a 5-year disqualification from holding federal office on completion of the term of imprisonment. Or have you forgotten about these norms of U.S. justice, Mr Thatcher? While protecting its own society from law violations, the United States considers it has the right to demand "freedoms" for criminals in socialist countries. What about the "flouting of human rights" here? The same crimes are punished -- and very strictly -- in the United States. Where is the logic then?

But this is not the logic which Gary Thatcher follows. He sticks to a different logic: there can be no rights in the "empire of evil." And he convinces the readers of THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR of this.

A September issue of the paper carried his article describing his "impressions" of Soviet motor ferry plying between Leningrad and Stockholm.

"The Baltic Steamship Company invites you to take a fascinating trip. Cosiness, comfort, a varied program of entertainment, and solicitous service ensure you have a good time," was the reply to my question as to the travelling conditions on board the Ilich given by a girl at No. 35 Harzen Street, when I phoned the Baltic Steamship Company passenger agency in Leningrad.

Gary Thatcher retained a different impression. He was not in the mood for entertainment. So what was he so busy with? The reply lies in his article: "The tourist business is only a cover for the real aim of the Ilich's trips along the coast of Sweden. Its aim is to gather intelligence information with the help of electronic apparatus..."

Rubbish? Of course. But Gary Thatcher decided to make a name for himself precisely from this absurdity. Are there other examples? Certainly.

Thus, in September CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR published an article by its Moscow correspondent entitled "The Ever Increasing Significance of Russian bread!" Thatcher tried to demonstrate that the symbol of the Soviet Union today is a woman pressing loaves of bread to her chest. No more...

"Whatever happens there, poverty remains!" The newspaper subscriber paints a "terrible picture." "The Russians have nothing but bread, and even that is probably stale!..".

"Yes," Thatcher persuades him, "Bread has become the symbol of the good life in the Soviet Union, as in no other country!.." Indeed, Mr Thatcher, guests in Russian have long been greeted with bread and salt. Write about that too. Such is the tradition of Russian hospitality. Guests are greeted in our country with good will. But not those who come to our home with ill will.

They are turned away from the door. That is also tradition and we do not wish to abandon our traditions.

MILLIONS AWAITING U.S. RESPONSE TO PEACE OFFER

LD232328 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 23 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Millions of people throughout the world, including the United States, are awaiting a specific and well-grounded reply from Washington to the Soviet peace initiatives set forth in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. This historic program, corresponding to the interests of all mankind, cannot be brushed aside with a polite statement that the Soviet proposals merit serious study. Figures of state and ordinary people in many countries want to know whether the White House is prepared to meet the realistic Soviet disarmament program half-way.

The USSR's proposals are dictated by political wisdom. This is the opinion of William Fulbright, former chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress. It is essential to strive for the implementation of these promising initiatives, for which one should strengthen trust between our countries and first and foremost radically change idea about the Soviet Union, which is in many respects incorrect.

Here is the view of George McGovern, former Democratic senator, who called the Soviet program very constructive: I hope very much, he said, that the U.S. Administration will make use of this real opportunity to halt the arms race and will not undertake steps that would complicate the advance toward the liquidation of nuclear weapons. The USSR, stressed McGovern, has made a significant step forward and the United States should give an appropriate answer to this.

Side by side with such a realistic approach to the Soviet proposals, a different, militaristic tendency exists, or rather, prevails as before, in Washington's corridors of power. Under pressure from public opinion, the adherents of this tendency pretend that they too favor constructive negotiations with Moscow. This shows with particular clarity, as foreign observers note, in the White House's maneuvers. On the one hand it declares that the Soviet initiatives merit serious study, while on the other it continues to reject the call to join in the moratorium on all nuclear tests, announced unilaterally by the Soviet Union, and continues to press ahead with its "star wars" program, aimed at the militarization of space.

Time will tell whether the White House's position will undergo any change.

From the most varied capitals responses to the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev continue to flow in. They show that the Soviet initiatives have become a powerfully influential factor upon policy and public opinion throughout the world.

MPR'S YONDON VISITS MILITARY FACILITIES, DEPARTS

PM271904 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Touring the Country"]

[Text] Colonel General J. Yondon, Mongolian defense minister, who is on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, visited the M.I. Kalinin Taman Guards Motorized Rifle Division 23 January. The Mongolian guest was met by Army General Ye. F. Ivanovskiy, USSR deputy defense minister, and Colonel General V.M. Arkhipov, commander of Moscow Military District.

Colonel General J. Yondon familiarized himself with the teaching and material base, the organization of combat training, and the lives and leisure of Soviet servicemen.

The same day the Mongolian guest visited the Professor N.Ye. Zhukovskiy Military Air Engineering Academy. The Mongolian defense minister familiarized himself with the teaching and material base and the organization of the teaching process. Explanations were provided by Colonel General of Aviation V.V. Filippov, chief of the academy.

Colonel General J. Yondon was accompanied by Marshal of Engineering Troops S.Kh. Aganov.

In the afternoon Colonel General J. Yondon left on a tour of the country.

The Mongolian guest was seen off at the capital's Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Colonel General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and other generals, admirals, and Soviet Armed Forces officers.

(Ts.) Gombosuren, Mongolian charge d'affaires in the USSR, was among the send-off party.

The Mongolian and Soviet state flags were flown at the airport and the two countries' national anthems were played.

Colonel General J. Yondon, Mongolian defense minister, accepted the report of the chief of the honor guard and reviewed the Soviet servicemen.

On his trip around the country the Mongolian defense minister is being accompanied by Marshal of Engineering Troops S.Kh. Aganov.

U.S. INCREASES PRESSURE ON JAPAN OVER SDI

PM271345 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[S. Agafonov: "The Pentagon's Demands"]

[Text] Tokyo -- American pressure on its allies on the question of their involvement in the program to create space-based strike weapons continues to increase.

Since Bonn and London have yielded to pressure from Washington, "star wars" lobbyists are laying the main stress on Tokyo, which has not yet made a final decision on this problem.

As the Japanese press reports, the conservative American organization, the Heritage Foundation, which is considered the brain trust of the current White House administration, has prepared a report entitled "SDI Prospects for Asia." It formulates recommendations, the chief of which consists in the following: Involving Japan in implementation of the "star wars" program must be in the United States' prime task.

"Japanese technology is equal to American technology in many spheres, and, in a number of cases, leaves U.S. achievement behind," the report states. "Japanese participation in SDI will depend to a decisive extent on general progress in the sphere of the transfer of military technology from Japan to the United States."

Posing the issue in this way not only confirms American interest in Japanese scientific and technological achievements, but also indicates the mechanism, within the framework of which Tokyo's participation in SDI could be realized. The latter is particularly worthy of note, because here we have an attempt to present Japanese involvement in the "star wars" program not as a political step, but as a formal procedural issue relating only to expanding the sphere of working consultations between allies.

In actual fact, if we were to suppose that American demands connected with SDI were to be presented as ordinary demands for Japanese military technology in accordance with the agreement signed in 1983, when the very problem of Tokyo's participation in the preparations for "star wars" would be eroded to such an extent that it would cease to be considered a problem. The government would thereby be rid of painful debates with the opposition and protests by antiwar movements, and the Pentagon would get everything it is seeking.

Will the subterfuge work? As yet it is difficult to say. According to the latest official statements by Japanese political figures, Tokyo's position in relation to the "star wars" program has not changed: Japan expresses "understanding" of this program and is still "studying" it.

Within the framework of this "study" the second research group from Japan, headed by (R. Onodera), adviser to the Japanese ministry of Foreign Affairs, is at present in the United States. According to a report by the KYODO agency, the group has already visited the Pentagon's "space projects" and met with the head of the SDI program, General Abrahamson. Whether the American general was guided by the report by the Heritage Foundation in his talk with the Japanese representatives is unknown. But we can be totally clear on the fact that Washington is seriously getting down to working on Tokyo in the question of preparation for "star wars."

We wish you, esteemed Mr President and esteemed Mr Prime Minister, good health and success in your work and happiness and prosperity to the friendly Indian people.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;

The USSR Council of Ministers

Indian Envoy Interviewed

LD271501 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Jan 86 First Edition p 3

[Interview with S. Nurul Hasan, Indian ambassador to the USSR, by own correspondent S. Bulantsev under the "Our Interlocutor" rubric: "The Benefits of Freedom" -- first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] On the eve of Republic Day, which is also widely marked by the Soviet public, a SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondent asked S. Nurul Hasan, head of the Indian Diplomatic Mission in Moscow, well-known public figure and politician, and ambassador with the rank of minister of state, to give an interview.

[Bulantsev] How do you assess the present state of and prospects for the further development of Soviet-Indian relations?

[Hasan] Indian-Soviet relations are characterized by sincere friendship, mutual trust, and common ideals. Both our countries firmly believe in the policy of peaceful coexistence, sovereign equality, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. We deeply value the support which we receive from the Soviet Union in various spheres.

Our traditional friendship has stood the test of time and has developed and strengthened over many years, covering broad spheres of cooperation. It is not directed against any third country. The Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation was an important landmark, it gave a qualitatively new boost to our relations. High-level visits and contacts play a very substantial role in strengthening our ties. We are looking forward impatiently to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's visit to India, where a most warm reception awaits him. Next year India and the Soviet Union are organizing magnificent festivals in the USSR and in our country respectively. That will undoubtedly lead to better mutual understanding and will bring our peoples closer together. In short, I consider our present relations highly satisfactory and dynamically promote not only the mutual interest of our two countries but also the cause of world peace. I have no doubt that over the years our friendship and cooperation will constantly strengthen.

PRODUCTION COOPERATION GROUP WITH INDIA ENDS WORK

LD251913 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 25 Jan 86

[Report by correspondent (?Ashot Basibov)]

[Text] The meeting of the Soviet-Indian working group on production cooperation and machinery construction has ended in Moscow. Our correspondent (?Ashot Basibov), reports:

I remind you comrades that during the years of Soviet-Indian economic cooperation, the following leading industrial enterprises including the heavy engineering works in Ranchi, the mining equipment works in Durgapur, the metallurgical combines in Bhilai and Bokaro, and 11 major electric power stations have been erected in the Republic with our country's help.

The enterprises of India's state sector, constructed with our country's cooperation, are now producing four-fifths of the Republic's metallurgical equipment, over one-third of oil products, and 40 percent of all steel.

India's industry now has reached such a level of development that the question has arisen of our countries' cooperation in the production of other types of output. This was discussed at the meeting of the Soviet-Indian working group on production cooperation and machinery construction.

What prospects are being opened up by cooperation? I addressed this question to Varadan, the Indian delegation head and secretary of the Indian Industry Ministry:

[Begin Varadan recording in English fading into superimposed Russian translation]

We have been devoting our main attention all of these years to cooperation [sotrudnichestvo] in machinebuilding. We now have for the first time turned to the idea of cooperation [kooperatsiya] that offers far wider opportunities for the volume of technology and the rendering of mutual aid. Both sides have arrived at the conclusion that they can profit from one another's experience in the development of such sectors as the machinetool and instrument industry, heavy and light machinebuilding, and equipment for the food and auto industries. As you can see, the possibilities for cooperation are immense. We are proposing that it must be on a long-term basis. A representative delegation of our country's industrialists has arrived with me. We have acquainted ourselves with the work of the Soviet Union's leading machinebuilding enterprises and are proposing specific ways of widening our mutually advantageous trade and economic ties. [end recording]

PAKISTANI SUPPORT FOR INDIAN 'EXTREMISTS' NOTED

LD271430 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] The PRESS TRUST OF INDIA news agency has reported a new armed sortie by Sikh separatists in the Punjab. They opened automatic fire on a group of inhabitants in Shantinda which resulted in one being killed and several injured. Here is a Mayak commentary; at the microphone is Vladimir Beloshapko.

While this report was coming in there was another alarming telegram from India. Becurity forces in Jammu and Kashmir have arrested six members of antinational reactionary organizations. They are charged with provocative disturbances and setting off bombs.

What was this? A chance coincidence? Two events which were in no way interconnected? At first glance it would seem so, but only at first. Let us ask a few essential questions. Firstly, why were the north-western and northern regions of India which border on Pakistan the arena of terrorist subversive activity? Secondly, who is supplying arms and money to the extremists and who is teaching them the science of killing, bombing, and plunder? And, lastly, who is gaining from the permanent interpolitical tension in these and other Indian states? In one way or another the Pakistani military regime's unseemly role seems to feature in replies to these questions

It is well known, in particular, that special schools and camps have been set up on Pakistani territory where the rebels undergo a course of training under the guidance of Pakistani instructors. There they are supplied with weapons and money. Why? Indeed, it would appear that the clearly understood goodneighborly relations with India would meet Pakistan's national interest, and incidentally Islamabad declares in words its desire for this. But it goes no further than words. By all accounts it is the influence of their U.S. patrons on the present regime in Pakistan which holds sway. Indeed, several years ago, the so-called Kirkpatrick plan found its way into the pages of the Western newspapers. This envisaged nothing more nor less than India's dismemberment into a number of tiny states. A despairing cause, surely? But an attempt is obviously being made to chase the republic up a blind alley of internal disorder and in this way to move away from constructive participation in tackling the key problems of the present day. This is being attempted with the aid of terrorists and their trustees in Islamabad.

PRAVDA'S AFANASYEV VIEWS INDIAN TIES WITH USSR

PM241650 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Third and final part of V. Afanasyev series: "Contemporary India"]

[Excerpts] Peace-Loving Country

India is a country which shows goodwill, attention, and understanding toward the p peoples of the world. Its policy has earned it high prestige in the international arena. It has spoken weighty and authoritative words for the sake of terminating the arms race, and primarily the nuclear arms race, on earth and preventing it in space, for the sake of peace and the peoples' security.

The international community shows great respect for the policy of nonalignment, whose recognized leader is India.

The world's progressive public highly assessed the joint message sent by India's prime minister and the leaders of Mexico, Sweden, Greece, Argentina, and Tanzania to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan shortly before their meeting in Geneva. The message emphasized that the prevention of nuclear war is a key issue for the peoples of all continents. The ideas contained in the message are in harmony with the Soviet Union's policy aimed at the prevention of thermonuclear war.

We were informed from Delhi that M.S. Gorbachev's statement, made on 15 January, generated enormous interest and support among the broad Indian public. The statement is a program for total nuclear disarmament. The statement is also a passionate call for mankind to enter the third millennium of our era without nuclear weapons, without chemical weapons. The new millennium should be a millennium of eternal peace and a bright future for mankind.

Speaking at a recent public meeting devoted to I. Gandhi's memory, R. Gandhi acclaimed the Soviet leader's plan as inspiring and expressed the hope that the U.S. response to it would be positive.

I have no doubt that India will understand and accept this program because, after all, peace in its view, as in the view of all peoples, is the basis and condition for advancing successfully along the path of progress.

People in India are devoting great attention to the Soviet initiative for the comprehensive solution of security problems in Asia. We were told of this by well known Indian politician (E. Faleyro) and other interlocutors. Peace is particularly necessary for Asia, where over half of mankind lives and where the majority of countries are developing countries.

At the same time, India's international position is far from trouble-free. There are forces both on Indian soil and abroad, in the West, which are doing everything to dismember the country and destabilize it. These forces are prepared to use any means -- slander, blackmail, bribery, and crimes -- to attain their goals.

An alarming situation prevails along the Indo-Pakistani border, where the sides' troops are, so to speak, eyeball to eyeball. Pakistan is implementing an openly anti-Indian policy.

There is a widely-held opinion in the West that religion is the basis of differences between India and Pakistan. Apparently the Muslims (Pakistan) cannot get along with non-Muslims (India). In fact, the position is completely different, even if only because there are more Muslims living in India than in Pakistan.

India is prepared to normalize relations with Pakistan but this, as we were told here, is practically impossible while Pakistan follows not its own but a pro-American policy. The United States has supplied Pakistan with the most up to date weapons, and it has been assigned the role of gendarme in Asia, like the one played in the past by Iran under the shah. There are serious reasons to suppose that Pakistan intends to acquire nuclear weapons, and this is particularly worrying for the Indians. In a conversation with us, G. Parthasarathy, chairman of the Foreign Policy Planning Committee, declared in this connection: "India will follow Pakistan's nuclear armament very carefully and will draw its own conclusions."

It is evident that India also faces quite a few foreign policy problems. The country is solving these problems calmly and confidently, on the basis of the principles of equality and mutual security. It is solving them for the sake of peace on earth.

Our Relations Strengthen and Develop

Soviet people feel profound respect for India and its talented and industrious people. Relations of sincere friendship and cooperation have been established between our countries. These relations are developing on the basis of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation signed 9 August 1971. These relations are distinguished by equality and mutual respect and by the coincidence or proximity of the USSR's and India's stance on fundamental problems of our time.

The friendship and cooperation between the two countries are cemented by their peoples' common interests in the struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism, and racism and for peace and progress on earth. They are an important factor for peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world, and this factor's significance is constantly growing.

The Soviet Union's cooperation with India has many dimensions. Its features include stability in the political sphere and extensive and multifaceted forms of mutually advantageous trade, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural exchanges.

A new and powerful boost was given to the further deepening of mutual understanding and the expansion of cooperation between our countries by R. Gandhi's visits to the USSR in May and October 1985 and his meetings with M.S. Gorbachev. In the course of conversations with us, R. Gandhi warmly recalled these meetings and expressed the hope that he would meet our party's leader on Indian soil this year.

The Soviet Union rendered India great assistance in the establishment of its modern industry. The Bhilai metallurgical plant, the Bokaro metallurgical combines, the Ranchi heavy machine building plant, the Durgapur mining equipment plant, the Hardwar heavy electrical engineering plant, and dozens of other enterprises were created with our participation or assistance.

In 1982 these enterprises accounted for 38 percent of total steel production, 25 percent of petroleum extraction, 40 percent of petroleum refining, 70 percent of power industry equipment, and 80 percent of metallurgical equipment.

A seminar on "Indian-Soviet Trade and Economic Cooperation" was being held while we were in India's capital, Delhi, and hundreds of Indian businessmen, ministers, and Soviet representatives took part. Impressive figures on the growth of our trade and economic relations were cited there. For example, the volume of Soviet-Indian trade increased one-hundredfold between 1953 and 1985.

An agreement on the further development of Soviet-Indian trade relations was signed last December. The volume of trade will double in the next 5 years compared with the previous 5-year period.

At the same time, certain complaints were heard about some of our organizations. We were asked: Why is it that, in the sphere of assistance to India, we pick the heavy, materials- and energy-intensive sectors, and give it little in the sphere of computer equipment, robotics, bioengineering, and flexible production units? Addressing the seminar, Indian Minister of Finance V.P. Singh spoke of the need to import the latest technology from the USSR. He also said that it is necessary to improve the quality of Indian exports to the USSR.

In our conversation with professor M.G.K. Menon, who, incidentally, is a foreign member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, we spoke mainly about Soviet-Indian cooperation in the spheres of science and technology. This cooperation takes place through intergovernmental channels and through academies of sciences and various organizations and departments. The scientist expressed the wish that this cooperation be conducted more purposefully and more systematically, primarily in the most modern avenues of science and technology. It would be good, the professor argued, to convene something like a seminar of a small number of scientists (5-10 people from each side), capable of looking far ahead, of discussing and determining the latest scientific and technical problems on whose elaboration we can cooperate both now and in the long-term future. It would be good to elaborate joint scientific and technical programs, practice division of labor, organize production sharing, set up the appropriate organizations, and afterward make joint use of the results produced. After all, the Soviet-Indian space flight program was successful. Serious thought must be given to all this.

...The CPSU delegation was warmly welcomed in India. When we presented R. Gandhi with the CPSU Central Committee's greetings message to the jubilee session of the Indian National Congress-Indira, thousands of delegates stood up and applauded warmly and at length.

We met many friends of our country here. I would like to mention (Aruna Asaf Ali), a no longer young but shapely and lively woman, active participant in the national liberation movement, organizer of the women's movement in India, and winner of the international Lenin prize "for the strengthening of peace among peoples." She has been in the Soviet Union on many occasions and said during our conversation that she would very much like to visit our country once more. It seems that her wish will come true.

Our numerous interlocutors expressed sympathy for the Land of the Soviets and confidence that the friendship and cooperation between India and the USSR and develop.

This is how it should be. This is how it will be.

TV REPORTS ON KARMAL NEWS CONFERENCE IN KABUL

LD271031 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Report from Kabul by M. Leshchinskiy on 26 January news conference by DRA [illegible] Babrak Karmal for foreign journalists; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Among the flow of lies and slander which form the basis of psychological warfare being waged against the DRA by subversive propaganda centers in the West, one of the basic ones is the thesis that in Democratic Afghanistan representatives of the Western press have no access. Therefore they are supposedly forced to enter the country illegally and look for their heroes on the counterrevolutionary bandit paths. However, here are these 23 representatives of some of the largest television and radio companies in the Western world, news agencies, and the press, who have had the opportunity to see for themselves the falsity of many of the allegations by Western propaganda. They have been in Afghanistan for nearly 1 week and in conversations with journalists we have understood how important this trip has been for them, and how many new things they have found out for themselves.

This meeting with Comrade Babrak Karmal crowned the journalists' trip. Replying to a question from a correspondent of the British REUTER news agency concerning the progress of the Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva and the dates [sroki] for the withdrawal of the limited contingent of USSR forces from Afghanistan, Comrade Karmal stressed that proceeding from the peace-loving policy of people's power, the Afghan side is striving for positive results at the Afghan-Pakistan talks. However, the Pakistani side, acting on U.S. orders, is trying to freeze and break off these talks, rejecting at each new round decisions adopted the day before.

As for the withdrawal of the limited contingent of USSR forces in Afghanistan, Babrak Karmal noted that this will happen when the reasons which prompted the Afghan Government to address a request for aid to the USSR are eliminated. That is to say when the military interference by imperialism and regional reaction in the affairs of Afghanistan is halted.

At the end of the news conference, the foreign journalists expressed profound gratitude to the Government of Democratic Afghanistan for the invitation to visit the country and for what they have been able to see and find out here.

DRA TRIBES ON PAKISTANI ACTIONS AGAINST PASHTUNS

PM231600 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Jan 86 p 3

[TASS report: "Tribes' Jirgas"]

[Text] Kabul, 18 Jan -- BAKHTAR reports that a jirga of the Afridi tribe chaired by Wali Khan (Kukikheyl) has been held in the (Tuda Mina) region. Addressing its participants, the Afridi chief resolutely condemned the Pakistani authorities' aggressive actions against Pashtun tribes.

He opposed the use of the territory to resettle Pashtun tribes in order to train dushman gangs. Wali Khan (Kukikheyl) demanded the elimination of training camps for Afghan counterrevolutionaries and the immediate release of Pashtuns imprisoned during the combat actions in the Khyber region.

The jirga participants adopted a resolution stating that Afghanistan's friendship with tribes with historic roots is indissoluble. All attempts by the Pakistani regime to undermine the principles and foundations of that friendship are doomed to failure.

BAKHTAR reports that a thousands-strong tribal jirga in support of the just struggle of the Afridi and the Shinwari for independence has been held in the city of (Ganikheyl) (DRA) -- the administrative center of the Shinwari region.

EGYPTIAN NEWSMAN APPLAUDS DRA ATTITUDE TO MUSLIMS

PM231432 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jan 86 Moring Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Afghanistan: In the Interest of the Broadest Strata of the Population"]

[Text] Cairo, 21 Jan -- The revolutionary Government of Afghanistan acts in the interests of the broadest strata of the country's population, carrying out bold progressive transformations. At the same it treats the traditions of all the peoples of Afghanistan with deep respect, the well-known Egyptian journalist 'A. al-Tawil, who recently visited the DRA, writes in the newspaper AL-SIYASI.

I was convinced by my own experience, Al-Tawil stresses, that the accusations made against the country's government by reactionary forces are totally groundless. The rulers of the many states which are always going on about their commitment to Islam should learn something from the Afghan leadership's genuinely democratic attitude to religion and the clergy. This is shown, the author observes, by the regular meetings that B. Karmal has with the country's religious figures. I learned about the activity of the council of mullahs set up right after the revolution and conversed with believers themselves. There is no doubt that all the claims about Muslims' religious sensibilities being trampled on and things sacred to Islam being abused are needed only by the reactionaries and their protectors who send bandits into the country in the guise of "defenders of the faith." Islam does not have to be defended from anyone in Afghanistan, just as the Afghan people do not have to be saved from anyone. There is no doubt whatsoever that all political power in the DRA belongs to the people themselves, the Egyptian journalist concludes.

USSR POSSIBLE 'GUARANTOR' OF CAMBODIA ACCORD

HK271512 Hong Kong AFP in English 1454 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Singapore, Jan 27 (AFP) -- Moscow is willing to be a guarantor to a Cambodian peace accord worked out between the three Indochinese states and the ASEAN non-communist regional grouping, the Soviet Embassy said here today.

Embassy spokesman Vladimir Taranenko told a special news briefing that such an accord could lead to the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia next year.

Mr Taranenko said that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shervardnadze during his trip last week to North Korea had spoken of the need for a negotiated settlement of the Cambodian issue to achieve peace in the region.

Mr Shevardnadze's deputy, Mikhail Kapitsa had made a similar statement at a press conference earlier this month in Moscow, he added.

The statements, which some diplomatic analysts saw as Moscow's impatience with Hanoi, was followed last week by a meeting of Indochinese foreign ministers in Vientiane last week when the Cambodian conflict was discussed.

The three Indochinese countries are Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos.

Mr Taranenko denied any split with Hanoi and said that Moscow backed the Indochinese states inplans for a dialogue with ASEAN, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, which groups Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines.

ASEAN supports the three Cambodian resistance groups opposed to the Phnom Penh government.

He said the problem had to be resolved primarily between ASEAN and the Indochinese states, but that the Soviet Union was prepared to take part in any international conference and be a guarantor for a peace accord worked out through such talks.

The new Soviet suggestions have yet to be put to the ASEAN governments Mr Taranenko said.

The suggestions come at a time when the new president of the United Nation's International Conference on Kampuchea (Cambodia) Leopold Gratz is making a swing through Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia gathering views before visiting Hanoi next week.

MURAKHOVSKIY, SRV VISITOR DISCUSS AGRO-INDUSTRY

PM241406 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meetings, Conversations"]

[Text] V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Agro-industrial Committee, received 23 January To Huu, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and first vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers. A wide range of questions concerning the development of nationalagro-industrial complexes was discussed.

GORBACHEV MEETS ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY LEADER

PM281027 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[Text] On 27 January, Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party In the ensuing conversation, the two sides briefed each other on the domestic political activity of the two parties as well as the course of preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress and the 17th Congress of the Italian Communist Party.

Gian Carlo Pajetta, member of the leadership and Secretariat of the Italian Communist Party Central Committee took part in the conversation, which was held in an atmosphere of comradely frankness and cordiality.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Alessandro Natta are to continue their meeting on 28 January.

FURTHER ON TOLKUNOV VISIT TO FRANCE

Quoted in Le MONDE

PM271415 Paris LE MONDE in French 26-27 Jan 86 p 4

[Unattributed report: "Reduction in USSR's Nuclear Forces Depends on Abandonment of SDI"]

[Text] If the United States implements its Strategic Defense Initiative, "we will not be able to reduce our nuclear forces," Mr Tolkunov, head of a Soviet parliamentary delegation now visiting Paris, told several journalists on Friday, 24 January. However, without giving any further details, he added that it "is possible to reach agreement in a specific sphere without waiting for results to be obtained in the strategic arms or other spheres."

The head of the Soviet delegation also said that the CPSU Congress, due to start on 25 February and which should last until 5 March, will change "more than one third" of the members of the CPSU Central Committee elected by the previous congress in 1981. According to him, the congress should also lead to "enormous changes" in the economic sphere.

Mr Tolkunov, who chairs the Soviet of the Union in Moscow (one of the two houses of the Supreme Soviet), and the USSR parliamentary group, visited Paris at the invitation of the senate Franco-Soviet friendship group.

He was received by External Relations Minister Roland Dumas, Alain Poher, speaker of the Senate, and Louis Mermaz, speaker of the National Assembly, who visited the USSR last month and was received by Mr Gorbachev.

Departs for Moscow

LD271720 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1429 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Paris, 27 Jan (TASS) -- A USSR parliamentary delegation headed by Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union and chairman of the USSR parliamentary group, left Paris for Moscow today.

The delegation had been in France at the invitation of the French Senate's Franco-Soviet friendship group.

The delegation was seen off at Charles de Gaulle Airport by (Serge Boucheni), deputy chairman of the Senate's Franco-Soviet friendship group and other officials. Among those seeing the delegation off was Yuriy Vorontsov, the USSR's ambassador to France.

IZVESTIYA CITES FRENCH DEFENSE MINISTER ON SDI

PM271457 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Yu. Kovalenko: "The Position Is Changing?"]

[Text] Paris -- The newspaper LE MATIN, which is close to the authorities, reports a statement by P. Quiles, French defense minister, to the effect that the French Government has a positive attitude toward participation by French enterprises in the "Strategic Defense Initiative".... It would be a pity, he said, if they were unable to participate in contracts with Americans in the implementation of SDI. This is the first time since debates on the European attitude toward this American program began, LE MATIN points out, that Paris has thus spoken in favor of involvement by French companies in SDI.

According to the newspaper, scientists at a laboratory in Marcoussis, the scientific research center for the firm Compagnie Generale d'Electricite (work is being conducted there to create laser weapons), whom P. Quiles was addressing, were staggered by these words.

Although the minister's statement does not cast doubt on the fact that France is against SDI at state level, the newspaper stresses, it nevertheless attests to the evolution of Paris' position on this question. Until very recently, LE MATIN writes in conclusion, the government has not supported French firms such as Matra and Thomson, which have declared their intention to join the American programs connected with SDI.

GORBACHEV REPORTEDLY ASKS KOHL'S SUPPORT ON PROPOSAL

AU271601 Paris AFP in English 1555 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Bonn, Jan 27 (AFP) -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has asked West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl for support in realising the January 15 Soviet arms proposals aimed at the total suppression of nuclear weapons, a report here says.

A letter to Chancellor Kohl from Mr. Gorbachev, reported in tomorrow's edition of the mass-circulation BILD ZEITUNG, said it is "high time, given the over-worrying international situation, to follow through on words of action."

The U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative, he warned, runs "counter to hopes for a reduction and, eventually, a liquidation of nuclear armaments on earth," the letter, transmitted on January 16, said.

Mr. Gorbachev reiterated the Soviet Union's decision to extend, by three months, a unilateral halt on nuclear tests that had expired December 31.

Turning to his proposals for a nuclear-free Europe, Mr. Gorbachev told Mr. Kohl that he insisted that the United States should agree not to deliver U.S. weapons to its European allies, and that Britain and France must not increase their own nuclear arsenals.

PORTUGUESE COMMUNIST PARTY CITED ON ELECTIONS

LD271335 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 27 Jan B6

[Text] Lisbon, January 27 TASS -- Right-wing candidate Diogo Freitas do Amaral and former prime minister, former leader of the Socialist Partu Mario Soares have totalled the biggest share of votes at Portugal's presidential elections, according to preliminary official returns. They got 46.4 and 25.4 votes respectively.

About 21 per cent of the voters backed representative of Portugal's democratic circles Francisco Salgado Zenha. Maria de Lourdes Pintasilgo got 7.3 per cent of the vote.

Since none of the candidates won an absolute majority, the second round of the presidential election will be held on February 16. Freitas do Amaral and Soares will vie for the post in the second round.

According to a statement by the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party, the results of the election will hold unfavourable prospects for democracy in the country. They confirmed the danger to which the Portuguese Communist Party repeatedly pointed and against which it had persistently fought.

The results of the voting were due to the demagogy of the right-wing forces, manipulation of public opinion by the mass media bodies and their joint campaign against the democratic candidate.

Portugal's working people and progressive public should not lose heart -- the struggle will be continued, the statement stresses.

PAPANDREOU EXPRESSES SUPPORT FOR GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

LD271800 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] New Delhi, January 27 TASS -- Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou highly appraised the proposals contained in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. Speaking at a press conference here today, he noted that "The new initiatives of the USSR constitute one of the most positive steps that could be taken in this situation". The head of the Greek Government, on an official visit in India, said that the problems of war and peace had been in the focus of attention during his talks with Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. There has been the discussion of the role that the six countries, signatories to the Delhi declarication, must play in the development of their efforts toward disarmament, particularly in the light of the new Soviet proposals.

In these conditions the six countries must consider their steps. We have complete accord on the question of great importance of the Soviet initiative, he said.

The Greek prime minister expressed the confidence that the developing countries, above all the Non-aligned Movement, can play an important role in the implementation of the tasks set in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement.

Andreas Papandreou expressed concern over the situation in the Mediterranean in connection with the United States actions against Libya. We declare against any military action of the United States in the Mediterranean, since this might have very serious consequences for the situation in the region, he stressed.

CPSU SENDS GREETINGS TO SAN MARINO PARTY CONGRESS

PM271401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[Text] To the 11th San Marino Communist Party Congress

Dear Comrades,

The CPSU Central Committee greets the delegates to the 11th congress of the fraternal San Marino Communist Party [PCS] and wishes the congress successful work.

Soviet Communists know about your party's struggle in defense of working people's vital interests and for peace, democracy, and social progress and about its fruitful activity in the San Marino Governemnt, formed from representatives of left-wing forces.

The Soviet Union values the long-standing friendly ties between the CPSU and the PCS. The realization of the need to prevent the arms race in space and end it on earth and to end all nuclear explosions, a realization stressed at the recent talks between the CPSU and PCS in Moscow, is of great significance in the current complex international situation.

The CPSU is putting forward a broad range of new initiatives aimed at ensuring a turn for the better in the development of the international situation. The Soviet Union has extended the moratorium on all nuclear explosions until 31 March 1986;has again appealed to the United States to adopt this step;put forward a detailed program for the gradual, total elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 through an accord preventing the militarization of space; and proposed the elimination of chemical weapons in the current century and that a resolute step he made along the path of conventional arms reduction.

A considerable part of the new Soviet initaitives apply directly to Europe. It could have a special mission in bringing about a sharp turn in favor of the policy of peace. That mission is the rebuilding [novostroyka] of detente.

The new Soviet proposals find a broad positive response and support among the European and world public.

We rate highly the tireless striving of the PCS, acting from Marxist-Leninist positions, to further develop relations of cooperation between the Soviet and San Marino peoples in the interests of strengthening peace and preventing nuclear war.

The CPSU Central Committee

SOVIET OFFICIALS, DFLP HEAD TO VISIT ADEN

GF281034 Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD in Arabic 28 Jan 86 p 1

[Text] Moscow -- Well-informed sources in Moscow have told AL-ITTIHAD that Soviet officials, accompanied by Nayif Hawatimah, secretary general of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, will go to Aden in the next 2 days to resume the talks that were held by Haydar al-'Attas, PDRY prime minister and provisional head of state, when he was in Moscow.

COMPARISON OF REPORTS ON DEPARTURE OF PDRY LEADERS

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 27 January in its First Edition on p 4 carries a TASS report under the headline "Departure From Moscow". The Pravda item has been compared with the Moscow TASS International Service report published in the 27 January DAILY REPORT, page H 1, and has been found to be identical with the following variation:

The PRAVDA version adds the following second paragraph:

"The South Yemeni visitors were seen off at the airport by G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials."

TRADE TALKS HELD WITH YAR DELEGATION

LD271229 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 27 TASS -- Questions of further development of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and Yemen Arab Republic are being discussed at the meeting of the inter-governmental commission for economic and technical cooperation between the USSR and Yemen Arab Republic, which opened here today. The Soviet delegation is led by Deputy Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations Yevgeniy Osadchuk, the delegation of Yemen Arab Republic -- Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Development, Muhammad Sa'id al-'Attar.

Trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and Yemen Arab Republic are of almost 25-year-long standing, a TASS correspondent has been told at the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. Bilateral trade was developing over the period, a number of major economic projects in different areas were successfully materialized in cooperation between the two countries.

Soviet organisations helped build in Yemen Arab Republic a cement plant in Bajila, an enterprise of metallic tare, a high capacity industrial refrigerator, a 200-kilometre-long Hodeida-Taiz highway line was driven.

Agriculture is one of the major areas of cooperation between the USSR and Yemen Arab Republic. Organisations of the two countries jointly did the project of establishing the Sardud state farm, with more than a thousand hectares of land having been prepared for agricultural development, about 40 kilometres of irrigation canals having been driven and 20 artesian wells drilled, a diesel electric power station and an electric transmission line were built. Good harvests of cotton, maize, millet, sorghum, fruits, vegetables and other crops are now grown on these previously waste lands.

A polyclinic and a hospital in Sanaa, schools for Yemeni children, built and equipped with technical assistance of the Soviet Union, are also among projects of cooperation between the USSR and Yemen Arab Republic.

REPORTAGE, COMMENTARY ON U.S. MANEUVERS OFF LIBYA

Al-Turayki Urges UN Action

LD280729 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 28 TASS -- Dr. 'Ali 'Abd al-Salam al-Turayki, secretary of the General People's Committee for Foreign Liason, has addressed a letter to Javier Perez de Cuellar attracting the attention of the international community to the American provocations against the Libyan Jamahiriyah. The letter notes that the exercises of the U.S. Sixth Fleet and the other U.S. forces in close proximity to the Libyan shores are an act of state terrorism and a new link in the chain of Washington's agressive actions spearheaded against Libya. The letter urges the U.N. secretary general to take measures in conformity with the U.N. Charter and international law to put an end to the U.S. provocations which create a threat to international peace and security in the Mediterranean.

Maneuvers 'Provocative Muscleflexing'

LD241923 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1700 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Text] The United States has announced the staging of military maneuvers which include aircraft taking off from aircraft carriers near the Libyan coast. Here is what our commentator writes in this context:

These maneuvers can only be considered as provocative muscleflexing in the face of an independent and sovereign state, especially since the waving of arms off the Libyan coast is accompanied by the rabid U.S. campaign against Libya and open threats against Libyan leader Al-Qadhdhafi. [words indistinct] As Ali 'Abd al-Salam al-Turayki, secretary of the Libyan People's Foreign Liaison Bureau, said in his interview with TANJUG, Libya wants to maintain peace and security in the Mediterranean, but if it were attacked it would defend itself by all possible means.

I think that you will agree listeners, that it is better for Washington to listen to sound reasoning rather than be dragged into an adventure which constitutes danger to the whole region, especially if we know that the Libyan Jamahiriyah is not alone. It enjoys the support of all the Arab countries and the Islamic Conference Organisation which includes tens of Arab and Islamic counties. Let us also notice that the current rabid U.S. campaign against Libya does not even enjoy the support of its closest NATO allies.

What is significant is that the arm waving policy was condemned by Brandt, Socialist International leader, and that U.S. envoy Whitehead who is now touring Europe has not been successful in his attempt to draw them into the American economic boycott of Libya. What is also significant is also the reaction by the Arab League social and economic council to U.S.economic sanctions against Libya. It urged all the Arab organizations to adopt effective measures to confront the policy of [word indistinct] pursued by U.S. imperialism.

Arab States Express Solidarity

LD250352 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 24 Jan 86

[By Middle East correspondent Leonid Rassadin]

[Text] The Arab states have expressed their solidarity with independent Libya, which is subject to open military threats by the United States. The radio stations of Tripoli, Algiers, Cairo, Kuwait and Damascus reported in their newscasts on the major U.S. Naval and Air Force maneuvers that started today in the southern Mediterranean. An armada of U.S. ships of the 6th Fleet has been put into action [zadeystvovana] -- cruisers, destroyers, and frigates, as well as the aircraft carriers Coral Sea and Saratoga, which carry F-18 fighter-bombers. Further, marines on board these aircraft carriers have been placed on a condition of increased combat alert.

A statement by JANA, the Libyan information agency, said the current exercises by the U.S. military near the Libyan coast obviously have a provocative character. In the opinion of Arab observers, the U.S. Administration, which is carrying out an economic blockade of modern Libya, has now moved to open military pressure upon this independent Arab country, a country that rejects any form of imperialist diktat. Washington, by its provocative actions, demonstrates that it is conducting a policy of state terrorism in relation to the Libyan Jamahiriyah.

A few days ago I spoke with the vice chairman of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization, Libyan representative Abd al-Wahhab al-Zintani. He said the U.S. military is threatening his country with aggression and intervention. However, the Libyan people cannot be frightened by blackmail, by provocations, or by coavalier diplomacy. We Libyans, Abd al-Wahhab al-Zintani stressed, are resolved to defend our sovereignty, our national rights.

USSR Muslim Organization's Statement

PM241907 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Dangerous Preparations Off Foreign Shores"]

[Text] It is the duty of every true Muslim no matter in which country he lives, the duty of all honest people on earth, to avert the threat hanging over Libya, deflect the hand of the U.S. Administration and its accomplices from the sovereign state, and raise their voice in support of the Libyan people. These words are contained in a statement by USSR Muslim Organizations, which has been distributed to representatives of the press.

The documents signed by representatives of the four spiritual boards of Muslims living in the Soviet Union, says: Muslims in the Soviet Union follow with great alarm the mounting tension in the Mediterranean, which is fraught with the gravest consequences for universal peace.

JANA Condemns U.S. 'Provocative Maneuvers'

LD260031 Moscow TASS in English 2349 GMT 25 Jan 86

[Text] Tripoli, January 25 TASS -- The JANA agency has strongly condemned the U.S. provocative manoeuvres which started in close proximity to Libya's shores.

After suffering a political defeat in the confrontation against the Libyan Jamahiriyah and exhausting all methods of pressuring the West European countries into joining in anti-Libyan sanctions, the agency says, the U.S. Administration has again recourse to the notorious gunboat diplomacy.

But Washington's open threats will not intimidate the Libyan people, will not make the Libyan Jamahiriyah give up its independent policy in support of the struggle of peoples for liberation, a policy of strengthening Arab unity and resolution of the Palestinian problem.

In staging a new crude provocation against Libya, the agency stresses, the U.S. Administration is playing with fire. The Libyan people will remain tranquil in face of this new sortie of the American military. Yet it is resolved to give any time a rebuff to the fresh action of White House state terrorism.

U.S. ATTEMPTING TO CREATE SEPARATE DEALS WITH ARABS

LD250024 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1630 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The United States and Israel are again trying to drag the Arabs into separate deals. Jordan was chosen as a target for their diplomatic activity. Israeli Premier Shimon Peres, speaking in London, pretended that his country is willing to undertake constructive actions in order to establish peace in the Middle East. He appealed to King Husayn to cooperate in this matter. He also said that Israel is willing to initiate a conference for peace in the Middle East.

A number of questions are currently raised. Is there really something new in the Israeli standpoint? How does Tel Aviv intend to solve the Palestinian problem? Why does Peres, while speaking about his efforts towards comprehensive peace turn only to the Jordanian monarch with his proposals?

Looking closely reveals that this so-called new Israeli stand will not bring the solution of the Middle East crisis even an inch nearer.

First of all, Israel, still, as ever, refuses to accept the Palestinian legitimate rights to self-determination. Peres, who is trained to play with words, prefers instead to talk about Palesinian self-expression and self-respect and even about an amazing self-entity. But when it comes to talk about an independent Palestinian state, he does not utter a single word. Accordingly, the basic issue for a settlement in the Middle East, which is the Palestinian question, is excluded in advance from the agenda of the proceedings.

With regard to Israel's willingness to hold an international conference, it is suitable to wonder about who will take part in it. Peres hinted without ambiguity that there will be no talking in any case about the presence of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, in such a conference, since the so-called moderates from the occupied territories, i.e. the traitors who are willing to give up the independence of their people if we name things by their names, will be appointed in advance as representatives to the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation.

The conference that Shim'on Peres talks about is in effect merely an attempt to find a sort of international cover for another separate deal in the Camp David mold. It has not become difficult now to understand the reason behind Israel's declaration of its loyalty to the question of peace when it turned to Jordan. The tactic is known, and is aimed at singling out an Arab country from the joint Arab front, and imposing conditions on it, with the help of the United States. Egypt was the first, then the plan was applied to Lebanon, and now it is the turn of Jordan. Within these circumstances, U.S. diplomatic activity increased as expected. American envoy Richard Murphy mediated between Shim'on Peres and King Husayn and it is not difficult to speculate about whose interest he defended, and about the pretexts he used. Before last December the United States abandoned its often-repeated promise to sell Jordan a consignment of modern weapons. President Reagan declared that the United States would only discuss this question if Amman were to undertake direct negotiations with Israel before 1 March.

What we have then is a fresh co-ordinated attempt by the two partners in a strategic alliance to make Arabs surrender to their conditions and to impose their control on Arabs. Diplomatic pressures are complemented by increasingly vigorous American military activity in the Mediterranean, and with the Israeli threats against Syria, and the piracy of the Zionists in South Lebanon. However, history convincingly confirmed that the policy of separate deals in the Middle East is doomed to fail. It is impossible to establish a strong peace by lessening the interests of either side.

Neither intimidation or control or the U.S.-Israeli diplomatic maneuvers are able to bend the determination of the Arab people for a true settlement and a true strong peace.

ARAB UNITY TO CONFRONT U.S.-ISRAELI 'MACHINATIONS'

LD251827 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 25 Jan 86

[Unattributed commentary: America's Anti-Arab Policy in the Middle East]

[Text] The Middle East situation once again has reached a degree of grave tension. The situation has reached such a critical level as a result of Washington's provocative actions. Threats continue to emanate from Washington to punish the Libyan Jamahiriyah. According to news agencies, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State John Whitehead stated Western Europe leaders a few days ago that the United States does not rule out carrying out a military action against Libya. The United States, through its strategic ally, is attempting to achieve its imperialistic ambitions in the Middle East. Libya is not the only country being subjected to attacks and threats. Threats are raised in Washington and Tel Aviv from time to time of possible actions against Syria. The two strategic allies believe that that country currently constitutes a dangerous obstacles to the spread of U.S.-Israeli control in the region.

It appears that an agreement has been reached between Washington and Tel Aviv on the distribution of roles. Israel has been charged with the task of dealing blows under the pretext of destroying terrorist targets on the territories of a number of Arab countries. Lebanon, the Yemen Arab Republic, Sudan, and Jordan are cited among possible targets for Israeli hawks or commandos.

Attention is drawn in this respect to suspicious U.S. reconnaissance flights during the last few days of last year in the Red Sea region and in the southern part of the Arabian peninsula. It appears special training on precision firing took place because all of the information from the U.S. reconnaissance aircraft reached the Israeli Air Force. [sentence as heard]

Meanwhile, Washington resumed its threats against the countries of the Arabian Gulf. General Kingston, of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force, commander in the Middle East, recently stated that it is possible for his forces to be transported to the Gulf region, to protect U.S. vital interests. The U.S. Administration frequently has used such false justifications in the past to increase its military presence in various parts of the world. A large-scale anti-Gulf state propaganda campaign currently is being intensified. The false anxiety regarding freedom of navigation once again is being expressed; however, as to the freedom and independence of other countries, the United States does not wish to recognize them clearly. In the U.S. opinion, the free and independent countries are only those that willingly yield to America. The United States adds those countries that venture to defend their national interests to the number of countries that do not suit it [America] and even consider them the terrorist ones. The United States practices a policy of state terrorism against these countries. That was the case with Tunisia, when Israeli aircraft, with White House approval and direct help from the Pentagon, dealt the blow that led to the killing of more than 70 Palestinians and Tunisians.

The aggressive U.S. and Israeli actions against the Arab countries has been and continues to be founded upon a groundless belief that the Arabs cannot possibly show realism and confront the policy of intimidation and pressure. But these calculations are meeting failure, since the endeavors to strengthen unity in the face of the U.S.-Israeli machinations are growing in the Arab world. Particular evidence of this is the firm support given to the Libyan Jamahiriyah by the other Arab countries. For example, the Kuwaiti National Assembly has announced its solidarity with the Libyan people who are facing the hostile forces' machinations. The Algerian APS news agency said that Algeria, which calls for respecting Libya's sovereignty and its territorial integrity, and also for maintaining the gains of the fraternal Libyan people, will not allow any harm to befall Libya. AKHBAR AL-KHALIJ, which is published in Bahrain in view of the U.S. and Israeli threats to the Arab world, has called on the Arabs to turn the solidarity which they have shown the Libyan people, into a permanent and effective tool of joint Arab policy to confront the anti-Arab U.S.-Israeli policy.

JORDANIAN FOREIGN MINISTER MEETS SOVIET AMBASSADOR

JN271438 Amman PETRA-JNA in Arabic 1418 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Amman, 27 Jan (PETRA) -- Foreign Minister Tahir al-Masri received the USSR ambassador in Amman in his office at noon today. During the meeting they discussed several international issues, particularly the current developments in the region, in addition to bilateral relations.

EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON U.S. SUPPORT FOR RSA

PM271607 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "The Imaginary Enemies of Apartheid"]

[Text] It has long since been observed that American policy is characterized by the divergence between words and deeds. As far as South Africa is concerned, this divergence has taken on a strikingly stable, tangible character.

They speak of "repugnance" for apartheid, but in reality they offer patronage to South Africa, that ultrareactionary state, seeing it as the defender of the West's positions throughout southern Africa. After all, South Africa supplies American industry, including military industry, with important types of strategic raw materials -- chromium, vanadiumm, gold, diamonds, uranium, the platinum group of metals, and others. It is an important military bridgehead in the extreme south of the African continent, controlling sea routes from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean.

The political crisis in South Africa has exposed what both the South African racists and their American patrons had tried so long and carefully to hide from the American and international public. The illusion had been purposefully and stubbornly instilled into the consciousness of millions of people that P. Botha's regime and its reforms are opposed only by a small group of extremists deceived by the "pro-Soviet and pro-communist ANC [African National Congress]" and guided by the notorious "hand of Moscow."

This pitiful propaganda fabrication has now burst like a bubble. Events have shown that huge masses of people have joined the active struggle against apartheid and that apartheid does not have the support, not only of the African population, the "coloreds," and the Indian community, but also of an increasing number of whites -- large number of representatives of students, the liberal intelligentsia, and religious figures. Nor does it satisfy representatives of business circles, who regard apartheid as a brake on further economic development.

Attempts to give the African National Congress of South Africa the false image of a "red terrorist bugaboo" have failed. The racists have not succeeded in undermining the masses' faith in this organization, South Africa's oldest democratic organization, which was set up back in 1912 and marches in the vanguard of the entire antiracist movement; nor have they succeeded in sowing discord between the ANC, the United Democratic Front, the trade unions, and religious, student, and other organizations of fighters against apartheid.

The development of the political crisis in South Africa confirms that the economic, ideological, and political foundations of the apartheid regime have grown shaky and rotten. But the racists and their American patrons do not want to admit it. Despite 17 months of uninterrupted racist terror, the White House continues to assert that "changes for the better" are taking place in South Africa and that they are about to move on from small reforms to big ones.

Behind this propagandist screen, the United States constantly blocks all proposals in the United Nations on the use of compulsory, all-embracing sanctions against South Africa, as provided for in Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The desire to protect Pretoria against more serious unpleasantness is the explanation for the limited restrictive economic measures announced by the U.S. President with regard to South Africa. Incidentally, immediately after this it was stated that the policy of "constructive cooperation" with South Africa will continue.

Active cooperation continues between Washington and Pretoria in foreign policy too. And here too it operates under cover of hypocritical declarations about the quest for "peaceful solutions" to the crisis situation in the South African region.

Positive initiatives to resolve regional problems cannot be expected from Pretoria. After all, for Pretoria all the problems amount to the same thing -- the preservation and strengthening of the power of the white minority. It is perfectly clear that this is the source of the persisting tension in southern Africa the constant threat to the security and sovereignty of neighboring states -- Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana, and Lesotho -- and the main obstacle to the resolution of the urgent task of the liberation of Namibia.

As for Washington, people there have recently been talking a great deal about the dangers of regional conflicts, including the present conflict in southern Africa. It is asserted at various levels that the United States favor the "peaceful resolution" of these problems. But these are false words.

Using the "stick" and "carrot" by turns, the United States and South Africa are trying to shatter the unity of the Frontline States and make them embark on a path of reconciliation with the racists and renounce their support for liberation movements. At the same time they are continuing their assistance to all kinds of bandit groupings, especially in Angola and Mozambique. Things have gone so far that last summer the American Congress gave the administration permission, in legislative form, to give assistance to UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], and it is now examining the question of allocating to Savimbi, ringleader of the Angolan bandits and former paid CIA agent, $27 million for "humanitarian" purposes. Moreover it is planned to give him a similar sum by way of a "secret operation." It is intended to receive this political adventurist in Washington at the end of January at official level, to hold some kind of talks with him, and to achieve accords. About what, one wonders? The expansion of banditry?

The United States and South Africa are still blocking the fulfillment of the UN plan on granting independence to Namibia (UN Security Council Resolution 435) and "linking" it with the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist servicemen from Angola. The latest puppet government formed by the South African occupying authorities in Namibia has not received international recognition, as was to be expected. Nor will it receive such recognition, since the UN plan provides for the holding of free elections monitored by the United Nations in Namibia, and not by any means for the creation of a neocolonialist regime there subordinate to the South African racists. The UN plan does not say a word about the Cuban troops, who are in Angola at the request of the legitimate Angolan government in order to help Angola to rebuff foreign aggression. The American "linkage" of the Namibia problem with the presence of Cuban military subunits in Angola is totally unfounded.

Various envoys from Washington try in vain to dictate to Angola the terms and timing for the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalists from Angola. This question will be resolved by Angola and Cuba with no outside interference when Namibia becomes a truly independent state and Angola's security and territorial integrity are reliably guaranteed.

American diplomacy in southern Africa resolves within a closed circle of mirages, illusions, and delusions divorced from living reality and the real situation prevailing in the region. The region's real, actual problems are the elimination of the apartheid regime and the liberation of Namibia. The United Nations has adopted a number of well considered and realistic resolutions on both problems, mainly on the initiative of African states, and these must be put into practice.

The Soviet Union has profound respect for the African states' opinion and supports their justified proposals on the imposition of compulsory and all-embracing sanctions against South Africa and their rightful demands for the immediate elimination of the apartheid regime in South Africa, the liberation of Namibia, and the cessation of aggressive and subversive actions by the forces of imperialism and racism against Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and other African countries. The Soviet Union is in profound solidarity with the national liberation movements -- the ANC and SWAPO [South-West African People's Organization] -- and with all states, public movements, and forces fighting for Africa's final and complete liberation from the vestiges of racism and colonialism.

Unlike the United States, Moscow has never seen the crisis in southern Africa, or other regional conflicts, from the standpoint of East-West relations, still less USSR-U.S. relations.

This stance rejects in principle any kind of political bargaining with the imperialist states on African problems behind the backs of the African countries and peoples and any interference in their internal affairs. This stance is approved and supported by all the true enemies of apartheid. And let nobody entertain the hope that the Soviet Union will retreat from this principled position.

SIERRA LEONE PRESIDENT RECEIVES SOVIET DELEGATION

PM261915 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Strengthening of Ties"]

[Text] Freetown, 24 Jan -- A USSR delegation headed by S. Mukashev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has arrived here to take part in events connected with the assumption of office by Sierra Leone President Joseph Saidu Momoh.

On 23 January the delegation was received by the country's president. The head of the Soviet delegation presented J. Momoh with a message of congratulations from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, briefed him on the progress of preparation for the 27th CPSU Congress, and drew the attention of the head of state to the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, setting forth the new Soviet peace initiatives.

The Sierra Leonean president rated highly the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy and its persistent efforts to ensure lasting peace on earth. The republic's government and people, he noted, note with great satisfaction the unflagging attention which the USSR pays to questions of the struggle for peace. The African countries adhere to the firm opinion that it is urgently necessary to halt the arms race and to channel the funds released into the needs of the developing states. We realize that if a global conflict breaks out there will be no victors, J. Momoh stressed. That is why we are attracted by the Soviet Union's positive approach toward problems of peace and we hope the other side will adopt the same stance.

The president expressed profound thanks to the Soviet Government for its important contribution to Sierra Leone's economic development, including in the field of cadre training. He expressed himself in favor of the further development and consolidation of mutually advantageous relations between the USSR and Sierra Leone.

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE GREETS PANAMANIAN PARTY

LD242354 Moscow TASS in English 2017 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 24 TASS -- The CPSU Central Committee sent a fraternal greeting to the 8th Congress of the People's Party of Panama, stressing that right after it was formed, the party of the Panamanian Communists joined the front ranks of the fighters for the vital interests of the working people and for establishing Panama's national sovereignty over the Canal Zone captured by U.S. imperialism.

The message of greeting said the People's Party of Panama now actively presses for the [illegible] democratic and independent development and for continuing the social changes started under the outstanding Panamanian patriot General Omar Torrijos Herrera and opposes the intrigues of external and internal reactionaries and the military policy of the aggressive quarters of imperialism.

The issue of delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear war is now in the center of world politics. "We see the full support given by the People's Party of Panama to the set of new Soviet peace initiatives as evidence of the communists' solidarity in efforts to solve this cardinal problem of the times," the message said.

The Soviet communists, the CPSU Central Committee stressed, think highly of the internationalist position of the People's Party of Panama and its solidarity with the socialist community, with new Nicaragua, which is upholding its independence and the chosen path of development against encroachments by imperialism, and with the liberation struggle by other peoples in Central and South America.

SOVIET, CUBAN OFFICIALS DISCUSS ECONOMIC PLANS

Cuban Delegation Arrives

FL232230 Havana Radio Reloj Network in Spanish 2133 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Text] Jose Lopez Moreno, vice president of the Cuban Council of Ministers and president of the Central Planning Board, Juceplan, arrived in Moscow today heading a delegation. The vistors will meet with their counterparts to discuss coordination of the two countries' economic plans for 1986-1990.

Committee Chairmen Meet

FL241427 Havana Radio Progreso Network in Spanish 1200 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Text] Konstanin Katushev, Chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, has met in Moscow with Ernesto Menendez, chairman of the Cuban State Committee of Economic Cooperation. During the meeting, Katushev and Menendez discussed diverse matters of bilateral cooperation, especially those referring to the most important goals to be carried out during the current 5-year period.

CASTRO REPLIES TO SOVIET GREETINGS MESSAGE

LD280937 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Cuban leader Fidel Castro Ruz expressed sincere gratitude for the fraternal greetings on the occasion of the 27th anniversary of the victory of the Cuban revolution in a telegram to the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidum and the USSR Council of Ministers.

NEW GUATEMALAN PRESIDENT LOOKS AT FUTURE TASKS

LD211449 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Text] Guatemala City, January 21 TASS -- The new Guatemalan Government is to tackle complex internal economic and social problems. "We must advance the national economy and create such economic mechanisms which would enable all citizens of the country to utilize its resources", President Vinicio Serezo of Guatemala has said in an interview with a TASS correspondent. The president entered upon his duties on January 14. He is a member of the Christian Democratic Party which won the general elections in December last year. The civilian government formed by him came to power to succeed the ultra-reactionary military regimes which had exercised their sway in Guatemala since 1954 when legitimate President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman was removed as a result of the U.S. intervention.

Speaking of the tasks of the new government, Vinicio Serezo also pointed out the need to create condition in Guatemala for all political forces, including left-wing organizations, to be able to participate in political life.

Touching upon Guatemala's foreign-policy course, the president said that the civilian government intends to concentrate efforts on solving the problem of integration of Latin American states as well as on bringing about a peaceful settlement of the Central American crisis. "We shall pursue an active policy in the region, the policy which envisages, firstly, neutrality in the event of any local confrontation and, secondly, the rendering of support to the process of intraregional talks within the framework of the Contadora Group as well as the dialogue between individual countries with a view to easing tension in the area".

The president of Guatemala positively appraised the results of the summit meeting in Geneva. "The talks between the leaders of the USSR and the United States", he emphasized, "are positive from the viewpoint of strengthening international peace. They serve to draw their stands closer together on the basis of respect for mutual interests. The dialogue between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States promotes not only relaxation of international tension but also a solution to complex problems facing all states, including the developing countries. With optimism and hope we are looking forward to new Soviet-U.S. meetings."